DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 811 RC 009 500

TITLE	Economic and Social Statistics for Americans of Spanish Origin. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Census and Population of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Ninety-fourth Congress, First Session on H.J. Res. 92: Joint Resolution Relating to the Publication of Economic and Social Statistics for Americans of Spanish Origin or Descent (March 21, 1975). Serial No. 94-8.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U. S., Washington, D. C. House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
REPORT NO	HR-Ser-94-8
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	71p.; Not available in hard copy due to small print size of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Census Figures; *Data Collection; Demography; *Economic Factors; Employment Statistics; Federal Government; Federal Legislation; *Social Factors; Socioeconomic Background; *Spanish Speaking; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	*Americans of Spanish Origin; *Congressional Hearings; HJ Res 92

ABSTRACT

Full and complete enumeration of the American population is a constitutionally mandated process whereby political representation in Congress is distributed. Census data are also used to calculate the allocation of funds to State and local governments for Federal assistance programs, to insure equal employment opportunity, and to protect voting rights. Because census statistics greatly shape Government policies and programs, it is essential that these statistics be accurate and complete. Past statistic gathering efforts by the Government for Americans of Spanish origin have been greatly criticized. This Nation's Spanish background people are still at a serious disadvantage because of the lack of meaningful statistics to determine their actual status. House Joint Resolution 92 is an effort to improve the accuracy and scope of the social and economic statistics gathered on Americans of Spanish origin. On March 21, 1975, testimony was heard on new efforts in the area of statistics data gathering by the Federal Government since the previous year. Witnesses included a member in Congress from California and representatives from the Demographic Fields and Spanish Statistics Staff of the Bureau of the Census; SER--Jobs for Progress, Inc.; National Congress of Hispanic American Citizens; Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; National Services Office of the National Council of La Raza; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. (NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED130811

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR AMERICANS OF SPANISH ORIGIN

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.J. Res. 92

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE PUBLICATION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR AMERICANS OF SPANISH ORIGIN OR DESCENT

MARCH 21, 1975

Serial No. 94–8

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RC009500

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
50-643 WASHINGTON : 1975

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina, *Chairman*
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona, *Vice Chairman*

DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania
JAMES M. HANLEY, New York
CHARLES H. WILSON, California
RICHARD C. WHITE, Texas
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
GLADYS N. SPELLMAN, Maryland
STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina
HERBERT E. HARRIS, Virginia
WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD, Michigan
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
NORMAN Y. MINETA, California
JOHN W. JENRETTE, Jr., South Carolina
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
ALBERT W. JOHNSON, Pennsylvania
JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California
ANDREW J. HINSHAW, California
JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas
GENE TAYLOR, Missouri
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
ROBIN L. BEARD, Tennessee
TRENT LOTT, Mississippi

JOHN H. MARTINY, *Chief Counsel*
VICTOR C. SMIROLDO, *Staff Director and Counsel*
THEODORE J. KAZY, *Associate Staff Director*
ROBERT E. LOCKHART, *Counsel*
ROY C. MESKER, *Senior Staff Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION

PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado, *Chairwoman*

WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina
GLADYS N. SPELLMAN, Maryland
WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD, Michigan
PAUL SIMON, Illinois

JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California
ANDREW J. HINSHAW, California

Ex Officio Voting Members

DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois

(DONALD F. TERRY, *Assistant Counsel*, Room 601, HOB Annex—Ext. 56741)

CONTENTS

Testimony of— Page

Barabba, Vincent P., Director, Bureau of the Census, accompanied by Daniel Levine, Associate Director for Demographic Fields; and Edward Fernandez, Chief, Spanish Statistics Staff 2

Cano, Narciso, assistant national director, SER—Jobs for Progress, Inc 62

Fernandez, Edward, Chief, Spanish Statistics Staff, Bureau of the Census 29

Fierro, Manuel, president, National Congress of Hispanic American Citizens 35

Motes, William C., Director of Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, accompanied by Vera Banks, David Brown, and Leslie Smith 9

Olivas, Roberto, director, National Services Office, National Council of La Raza, accompanied by Klaus W. May, research analyst 37

Roybal, Hon. Edward R., Member in Congress from California 18

Wetzel, James R., Assistant Commissioner, Current Employment Analysis, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor 13

Communication from—

Barabba, Vincent P., Director, Bureau of the Census, letter dated April 4, 1975, in response to questions during the hearing 34

Additional material—

Copy of H.J. Res. 92, subject of the hearing IV

94TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 92

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 14, 1975

Mr. ROYBAL (for himself and Ms. SCHROEDER) introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

JOINT RESOLUTION

Relating to the publication of economic and social statistics for Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

Whereas more than twelve million Americans identify themselves as being of Spanish-speaking background and trace their origin or descent from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Central and South America, and other Western Hemisphere Spanish-speaking countries; and

Whereas these Americans of Spanish origin or descent have made significant contributions to enrich American society and have served their Nation well in time of war and peace; and

Whereas a large number of Americans of Spanish origin or descent suffer from racial, social, economic, and political discrimination and are denied the basic opportunities they

I

deserve as American citizens and which would enable them to begin to lift themselves out of the poverty they now endure; and

Whereas State and Federal Governments and private organizations are now unable to determine accurately the urgent and special needs of the Spanish origin or descent in the United States because there is not a regular, nationwide evaluation of their economic and social status: and

Whereas the provision and commitment of State, Federal, and private resources can only occur when there is an accurate and precise assessment of need; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, immediately undertake a study to determine the feasibility and cost of developing and publishing monthly, in addition to quarterly, a nationwide unemployment rate among Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

SEC. 2. That the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture undertake further efforts to collect and publish regularly statistics which provide indicators of the social and economic condition of Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

SEC. 3. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Director of the Bureau of the Census and with the heads of other data-gathering Federal agencies, shall develop a Government-wide program for

the collection of data with respect to Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

SEC. 4. The Bureau of Census, in cooperation with appropriate State and local agencies and various population study groups and experts, shall immediately undertake a study to determine what steps would be necessary for developing creditable estimates of undercounts of Americans of Spanish origin or descent in future censuses.

SEC. 5. The Bureau of Census shall provide for the development and use of bilingual questionnaires and enumerators in the collection of data, and shall implement an aggressive affirmative action program for the employment of personnel of Spanish origin or descent.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATISTICS FOR AMERICANS OF SPANISH ORIGIN

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1975

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:35 a.m., in room 210, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Patricia Schroeder (chairwoman of the subcommittee) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRWOMAN PATRICIA SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Good morning.

The Census Subcommittee is receiving testimony today on House Joint Resolution 92, a bill to improve the accuracy and scope of the social and economic statistics which are gathered on Americans of Spanish origin. The subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Representative Richard White, held extensive hearings on this legislation in the 93d Congress. This morning we are particularly interested in any new efforts in the area of statistics data gathering by the Federal Government since the testimony of last year.

Full and complete enumeration of the American population is not to be achieved at the Government's convenience. The collection of this data is a constitutionally mandated process whereby political representation in the Congress is distributed. Census data are used to calculate the allocation of almost $15 billion to State and local governments for Federal assistance programs, to insure equal employment opportunity, and to protect voting rights, to name a few of the myriad uses of census data.

Because statistics on individuals in our society greatly shape Government policies and programs, it is essential that these statistics be accurate and complete.

There has been a great deal of criticism—and I believe it is legitimate criticism—of past statistic gathering efforts by the Government for Americans of Spanish origin. This Nation's Spanish background people are still at a serious disadvantage because of the lack of meaningful statistics to determine their actual status.

There has been some effort to improve the statistics gathered since 1970. However, it is my understanding that many problems arising out of the 1970 census will not be corrected until 1980. In the meantime, the citizens of Spanish origin continue to be undercounted and underrepresented in policy and programs that daily influence their lives.

I believe it is incumbent upon us to insure that the Government is fulfilling its obligation and is carrying out fully its responsibility to collect accurate and complete data on all Americans.

I welcome you to the committee, Mr. Barabba. As I said in my opening statement, I think the main thing we would like to do is to catch up from the more extensive hearings done last year, and we will be interested to have a current status report.

STATEMENT OF VINCENT P. BARABBA, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, ACCOMPANIED BY DANIEL LEVINE, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR DEMOGRAPHIC FIELDS, AND EDWARD FERNANDEZ, CHIEF, SPANISH STATISTICS STAFF

Mr. BARABBA. Madam Chairwoman, I certainly agree with you. We did appear before this committee, and our testimony this year reiterates the points we made last year. So with your permission I will just submit that testimony and attempt to summarize it rather briefly and make ourselves available for questions.

I have with me Mr. Daniel Levine, who is associate director for demographic fields within the Census Bureau, and Mr. Edward Fernandez, who is in charge of our Spanish statistics staff within the population division.

The preamble of the resolution, on page 2, states that "there is not a regular, nationwide evaluation of the economic and social status of the Spanish origin population." Our impression is that that is a somewhat misleading statement, since the Census Bureau currently publishes regular statistical reports on the social and economic characteristics of the population of Spanish origin.

As called for in section 1 of the resolution, the Bureau would willingly cooperate with the Labor Department in a study to determine the feasibility and cost of developing and publishing monthly unemployment figures on persons of Spanish origin. Such figures are now collected monthly by the Census Bureau in the current population survey for the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

However, in order to publish data which meets the stated standards of statistical reliability, the Bureau of Labor Statistics at present publishes a quarterly average estimate of the unemployment rate for the Spanish origin population rather than a monthly estimate.

Section 4 of the resolution calls for the Bureau of the Census in cooperation with various groups and experts "to determine what steps would be necessary for developing creditable estimates of undercounts of Americans of Spanish origin or descent in future censuses." I might note that the pursuit of the steps necessary to insure an accurate count of the various important groups in the population is and has been an accepted responsibility of the Census Bureau and that the Bureau has already initiated a study to determine the feasibility of measuring the coverage of Americans of Spanish origin in the 1970 census and in the course of this study will consider the problems and opportunities in developing estimates of the coverage of this group in the 1980 census.

We agree with the aim of the opening portion of section 5, but the wording raises two important issues. First, serious question exists as to the operational and technical feasibility of using bilingual ques-

tionnaires, and, second, the Bureau of the Census engages in data collection activities where multilingual questionnaires and enumerators are not necessary.

The second portion of section 5 may be unnecessary. It seems to imply the census does not have an active program for the employment of persons of Spanish origin. However, the Bureau, part of the Social and Economic Statistics Administration, already participates in an active program.

The committee may be interested in knowing that as a part of the planning process for the 1980 Census of Population we are in the process of forming an official Census Advisory Committee on the Spanish-Origin Population for the 1980 census.

The advisory committee will provide an organized and continuing channel of communication between the Spanish-origin population and the Bureau of the Census on the problems and opportunities of the 20th decennial census as they relate to the Spanish-origin population of the United States.

Finally, in the 10 months since the last meeting of this committee, the Census Bureau has published 18 additional reports containing information on the socioeconomic characteristics of the Spanish-origin population, including such topics as age, sex, residence, nativity, family status, marital status, fertility, school enrollment, education, employment, occupation, and income. We have brought copies of these reports for the committee's study.

Madam Chairwoman, that is the summary of our testimony.

[The complete prepared statement of Mr. Barabba follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF VINCENT P. BARABBA, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Madam Chairwoman, I appreciate your invitation to appear before this Committee to provide you with the Census Bureau's views concerning H.J. Res. 92 on the publication of economic and social statistics for Americans of Spanish origin or descent.

As I noted in my testimony last year, the Census Bureau welcomes the interest of the Congress in the collection and presentation of statistical information on this major population group, and we endorse the broad goals of the resolution. However, we do have reservations about some of the specific wording of the resolution.

The preamble of the resolution, on page 2, states that "there is not a regular, nationwide evaluation of [the] economic and social status [of the Spanish origin] population." However, this is somewhat misleading, since the Census Bureau regularly publishes statistical reports on the social and economic characteristics of the population of the Spanish origin. Beginning with data collected in our Current Population Survey in November 1969 and continuing in March 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974, the Census Bureau has published annual reports on the socioeconomic characteristics of the population of Spanish origin. A vast array of data is contained in these reports including information on basic demographic characteristics, such as age, sex, family relationship, family size, and marital status of persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American and other Spanish origin. And, in addition, data are presented on educational attainment levels, employment status, occupation, and income. The Census Bureau plans to continue the publication of this annual statistical portrait of the current socioeconomic status of the Spanish-ancestry population in America based on the March Current Population Survey. Since March 1973, the Current Population Survey sample of Spanish persons was doubled to provide more reliable statistics.

The Census Bureau also regularly publishes data on the Spanish-origin population collected in the Current Population Survey in other months of the year—school and college enrollment based on a survey conducted in October of each year, birth expectations and number of children ever born based on a survey

50-643—75——2

conducted in June of each year, and voter participation and registration based on a survey conducted in November of election years.

As called for in section 1 of the resolution, the Census Bureau would willingly cooperate with the Labor Department in a study to determine the feasibility and cost of developing and publishing monthly unemployment figures on persons of Spanish origin. Such figures are now collected monthly by the Census Bureau in the Current Population Survey for the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. However, in order to publish data which meet the stated standards of statistical reliability, the Bureau of Labor Statistics at present publishes a quarterly average estimate of the unemployment rate for the Spanish-origin population, rather than monthly data. The use of a quarterly average reduces the sampling variability that is associated with just a one month's estimate on a population of this size, and, thereby, increases the reliability of the unemployment data presented for persons of Spanish origin.

The Current Population Survey conducted monthly by the Bureau of the Census is the largest continuous survey of households in the Nation. Approximately 50,000 households are included in the survey every month. From this survey, we are able to provide a considerable amount of statistical detail on the socioeconomic characteristics of the Spanish-origin population and its major components.

However, even with a survey of this size, because of sampling variability, it is not possible to provide highly reliable monthly estimates of the unemployment rate for persons of Spanish origin. The Spanish-origin population comprises about 5 percent of the total population in the Nation, and the provision of monthly unemployment figures with a low level of sampling variability would require a considerable expansion of the Current Population Survey.

Section 2 of the resolution calls for the Bureau of the Census, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Agriculture to "undertake further efforts to collect and publish regularly statistics which provide indicators of the social and economic condition of Americans of Spanish origin or descent." As the preceding paragraphs indicate, the Bureau of the Census has developed in the past few years an extensive ongoing program of collecting and publishing statistics on the socioeconomic condition of this important population group. While we are committed to improving the program, significant further efforts will depend on continuing assessments of what is needed and feasible, as well as additional resource allocations.

Section 4 of the resolution calls for the Bureau of the Census, in cooperation with various groups and experts "* * * to determine what steps would be necessary for developing creditable estimates of undercounts of Americans of Spanish origin or descent in future censuses." I might note that the pursuit of the steps necessary to ensure an accurate count of the various important groups in the population is and has been an accepted responsibility of the Census Bureau and that the Bureau has already initiated a study to determine the feasibility of measuring the coverage of Americans of Spanish origin in the 1970 census. In the course of this study the Census Bureau will consider the problems and opportunities in developing estimates of the coverage of this group in the 1980 census.

We agree with the aim of the opening portion of section 5, but the wording raises two important issues. First, serious questions exist as to the operational and technical feasibility of using bilingual questionnaires; and second, the Bureau of the Census engages in data-collection activities where multilingual questionnaires and enumerators are not necessary.

We would respectfully suggest that these issues could be avoided and the intent of the section kept intact by the following wording: "The Secretary of Commerce shall ensure that, in the Bureau of the Census' data-collection activities, the needs and concerns of the Spanish-origin population are given full recognition through the use of Spanish language questionnaires, bilingual enumerators, or such other means as deemed appropriate by the Secretary."

The second portion of section 5, regarding the affirmative action program might constitute a separate section so as to avoid any implication that it refers only to the Bureau of the Census' data-collection activities.

The section may be unnecessary. It seems to imply that the Census Bureau does not have an active program for the employment of persons of Spanish origin. However, the Bureau, part of the Social and Economic Statistics Administration (SESA), already participates in an active program.

Specifically, the program structure provides for a Spanish-speaking employee to serve as a member of SESA's Equal Employment Opportunity Committee which is the advisory body to the Administrator on matters related to Equal

Employment Opportunity programs, plans, and progress. In addition, another employee is assigned as a Spanish-speaking personnel coordinator to assist in developing and carrying out specific efforts designed to inform, attract, and employ qualified persons of Spanish descent in the Bureau of the Census and in other parts of SESA. Furthermore, the Bureau is committed to developing staff capability to encourage and maintain effective relations and interest with community action groups, both local and national, including those concerned with the welfare of Spanish-speaking Americans.

The Committee may be interested in knowing that as a part of the planning process for the 1980 Census of Population, we are making intensive efforts to learn about the use of the 1970 data we have already published and about future data needs of the Spanish-ancestry population. In addition, we are making a concerted effort to elicit the active and continuing cooperation of the Spanish community and Spanish organizations in the conduct of the 1980 census. To this end, we are in the process of forming an official Census Advisory Committee on the Spanish Origin Population for the 1980 Census.

The Committee will provide an organized and continuing channel of communication between the Spanish-origin population and the Bureau of the Census on the problems and opportunities of the Twentieth Decennial Census as they relate to the Spanish-origin population of the United States. Experience has shown that there is a special need for such communication. Major efforts to improve statistics on the Spanish-origin population are necessary since decennial census data are widely used for such critical matters as legislative apportionment, allocation of government funds, and public and private program planning. The Committee will consist of 21 members appointed by the Secretary of Commerce from among a broad spectrum of community leaders, scholars, and other appropriate persons.

When we met with members of this subcommittee last year, we provided you with a series of Census Bureau publications containing data on the population of Spanish origin. In the 10 months since that meeting, the Census Bureau has published 18 additional reports containing information on the socioeconomic characteristics of the Spanish-origin population, such as age, sex, residence, nativity, family status, marital status, fertility, school enrollment, education, employment, occupation, and income, and we have brought copies of these reports for the Committee's study.

Providing current and reliable data on the Spanish-ancestry population in the United States is a vital and continuing concern of the Bureau of the Census, and we welcome your support and cooperation in this endeavor.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, for the opportunity to present this statement. I will be happy to answer any questions.

[The following index of Census publications was submitted for the record. The actual publications are retained in the files of the subcommittee.]

U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, REPORTS PUBLISHED MAY 1974 TO MARCH 1975 CONTAINING DATA ON PERSONS OF SPANISH ANCESTRY

CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS

SERIES P-20

Number and title

265—Fertility Expectations of American Women: June 1973
267—Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1974
269—Prospects for American Fertility: June 1974
272—Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1973
274—Educational Attainment in the United States: March 1973 and 1974
275—Voter Participation in November 1974
277—Fertility Expectations of American Women: June 1974

SERIES P-23

Number and title

49—Population of the United States—Trends and Prospects: 1950–1990
50—Female Family Heads

SERIES P-60

Number and title

94—Characteristics of the Low-Income Population: 1973 (Advance report)
98—Characteristics of the Low-Income Population: 1973

1970 CENSUS OF POPULATION REPORTS

Number and title

PC(81)-57—Characteristics of the Spanish Surname Population by Census Tracts, for SMSA's in Arizona
PC(81)-58—Characteristics of the Spanish Surname Population by Census Tracts, for SMSA's in California
PC(81)-59—Characteristics of the Spanish Surname Population by Census Tracts, for SMSA's in Colorado
PC(81)-60—Characteristics of the Spanish Surname Population by Census Tracts, for SMSA's in New Mexico
PC(81)-61—Characteristics of the Spanish Surname Population by Census Tracts, for SMSA's in Texas
PC(81)-62—Distribution of Foreign Stock Population: 1970

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you.

I take it in essence what you are saying is—maybe I am misinterpreting this—but you don't see this as a big enough problem to require legislation?

Mr. BARABBA. We encourage the resolution. We think it will bring a focus to the continuing problem, and we think there are some points made in the resolution that should be further reviewed.

What we are identifying is that we are making as effective use as we can of the current resources that are made available to the Federal statistical establishment.

We obviously have made some changes since the problem has been more forcefully brought to our attention, and we have reacted as adequately as we can.

As an example, the problem of producing unemployment statistics on a monthly basis would require a rather significant expansion of the current population survey, inasmuch as the Spanish origin population makes up about 5 percent of the total population. And for us to come up with a monthly statistic on the basis of that 5 percent of the sample would result in an estimate with much less statistical reliability than the standard now observed for the total population.

So, therefore, we produce estimates on a quarterly basis. If there was desire to move to a monthly basis, then there would have to be an increase in the amount of dollars allocated to conduct that study.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Section 4 was discussed lightly. What about the possibility of developing an estimate for an undercount on the 1970 census to get us through until 1980?

Mr. BARABBA. We have studies underway, but the major problem is that the estimate of the undercount is based on an ability to develop an independent estimate of what the count ought to be so that you can measure the actual count against it.

At this point in time there exists no reliable—at least not sufficiently reliable—independent data sets which allow us to come up with an independent estimate.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Tell me how you did this—that is, how you did this undercount—for the black community. Where did you get the independent data sets there?

Mr. BARABBA. Well, in this case the primary source of the information relates to vital statistics. This is the birth and death records, as well as immigration data. In the birth and death records as they exist today there is a category related to black population and the total population. There is no category that relates to individuals of Spanish origin, and that is the reason we are not able to come up with an independent estimate.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But there must be other ways to do this statistically. I can't believe that is the only way to do it.

Mr. BARABBA. There are other ways, and we are pursuing them, but none of them comes up to the level of quality that this particular approach uses. And it has been a position of the Bureau to attempt to maintain a high standard so that when this estimate is discussed to the extent to which it has been discussed on the basis of the black population and the total population that we are dealing with a reliable estimate.

So far we have not found a way that comes up to the standard we have set so far.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You couldn't do like a minicensus count in an area, a recount in an area, and use it as a basis for estimating in the future?

Mr. BARABBA. The problem with the recount is that it is not comparable with the time we took the census, and a lot of changes take place in a relatively short period of time.

I should also point out some of the same problems we had in counting the first time would surface again the second time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Section 4 may be one of the main concerns that I have, because, you see, more and more and more funds are being allocated on this basis, and there are certain parts of the country that are really getting hurt by undercount, if there is an undercount. And to let it continue to slide without changing the error until 1980 means you are not really going to be using it for formulas.

Mr. BARABBA. I should point out the undercount estimate is at the national level.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That's right.

Mr. BARABBA. We have been working rather vigorously on an attempt to come up to redistribute that undercount to smaller areas than the national count. We have not been successful at doing that.

I don't want to leave the impression that on the black population at this point in time we can tell you that of the 7.7 percent of the black people that we estimate we did not count 50 percent is located in Chicago or Denver or whatever it might be. We don't have a capability of doing that at this point.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think that that's what the real worry is.

Mr. BARABBA. Yes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That there appears to have been a gross undercount of certain segments of the population in 1970 and as they tie in more and more the census to the formulas, then certain areas are really getting shortchanged.

I think that is what some of the real urgency is to figure out if there isn't some way to remedy this situation. And what I hear you telling me is no, because there is no hard data base that you can compare it with. But I would think that there would certainly be other things that you could do. I mean I would—

Mr. BARABBA. I should point out, Madam Chairwoman, that our Black Advisory Committee has asked us this very same question, and we have undertaken to prepare a report which deals with the issues of the undercount, the impact that it has on various programs.

At the time that that report becomes available and finished as far as we are concerned, we will make it available to the committee, and I think it will give you better insight into the complexities of attemping to do this thing that all of us want to do, but there is a little gap beween what we would like to do and what we are capable of doing.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It is too complex to do? Is that what you are telling me?

Mr. BARABBA. Well, we have taken on many complex problems, but if the data sets do not exist, we can't create them.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You can't create them, but there have got to be other alternative ways to go.

Mr. BARABBA. We are pursuing those. But these are problems that when the 1970 census was being designed did not surface to the extent to which they are surfacing now, and this is one of the reasons that the primary objective of the 1980 census is to lessen the undercoverage of the count of the population, and we have to make determinations within the Bureau as to where we will put our priorities.

Right now our priorities are to insure it doesn't happen in 1980 to the extent that it happened in 1970, though I should point out 1970 was probably better than it was in 1960.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I always hear that answer from agencies, but it never makes me feel very good.

I would also like to have your priority be equally as much to try and remedy and find a way to remedy before 1980, because 1980 is a long way down the road. I just think that that is really very important.

Mr. BARABBA. Even if we placed equal priorities, the likelihood of accomplishing one which is to improve it for 1980 is much greater than attempting to redistribute it for 1970.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I don't think they are mutually exclusive.

Mr. BARABBA. They are not, and we are looking into it. But we have just gone down this path, and if the other data sets—and these are things we are now recommending—that are available, which we use for other purposes, had a category called Spanish origin, the task would be much easier.

But you can't go back to 40 or 50 years of vital statistics and birth and death records and all of a sudden attempt to assign the Spanish-origin category to them.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Does the gentlewoman from Maryland have anything to ask?

Mrs. SPELLMAN. It just points up, as I see it, the need for a 5-year census rather than a 10-year census. Here we go waiting 10 years before we can take care of some of the problems we recognize. We ought to be pushing in that direction.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Do you have any questions?

Mr. TERRY. No.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Motes?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. MOTES, DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY VERA BANKS, DAVID BROWN, AND LESLIE SMITH

Mr. MOTES. Thank you.

I have a very short statement which I can read or submit. It is similar to the one we gave last year.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Very good. If you can just summarize it and we can put it in the record, that will be fine.

Mr. MOTES. Let me introduce my colleagues first—Mrs. Vera Banks, David Brown, and Leslie Smith from Economic Research Service in the Department of Agriculture.

The last paragraph I think summarizes our position. I want to emphasize that the Department is concerned with the need for data regarding Americans of Spanish descent. If such data are to be obtained, we feel it would be more appropriate that the data be obtained through the expansion of the current population survey—that is, rather than expanding our farm surveys.

With substantial expansion of the current population survey by the Bureau of the Census, the development of such data on a more frequent basis for subgroups of the population and for subareas which are meaningful in this Department may be feasible.

If available, we would be interested in having such data for rural areas. However, we do not feel that this Department should collect the data because of the extra funding it would require and the fact that it would duplicate census programs.

We would be happy to answer any questions that we can.

[The complete statement of Mr. Motes follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. MOTES, DIRECTOR OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Madam Chairwoman. I am responding to your invitation of March 4, 1975. I am accompanied by Vera Banks, David Brown, and Leslie Smith of the Economic Research Service.

I will address myself only to the implications of the Resolution for the Department of Agriculture. Under the Resolution, the Department of Agriculture, as well as the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Labor, would "undertake further efforts to collect and publish regularly statistics which provide indicators of the social and economic condition of Americans of Spanish origin or descent."

At present, the Department of Agriculture has no means of complying with this provision. We do not maintain surveys of households or families that can readily provide regular economic and social indicator statistics for subgroups of the population. We do conduct periodic national sample surveys of farms. From these, we identify the population residing on farms, and the distribution of this population by location; by farm characteristics and by characteristics of the farm operator. The racial categories now used are white, black, and all other. There is no major problem involved in adding a category for people of Spanish origin. However, we have not added this category to the annual survey on farms and farm people because of the comparatively small number of persons of Spanish origin who live on farms. About one and a half percent of U.S. farm residents are of Spanish descent, as shown by the 1970 Census. This number is too small to allow very meaningful or reliable generalization from a sample survey of the size and design currently in use. While the Department could make a pro froma compliance with the resolution insofar as its current farm survey is concerned, the results would be

of little help in describing the general social and economic condition of Americans of Spanish origin.

We collect extensive statistics on the ethnic identity of persons participating in the programs of the Department. And, in the conduct of our economic and social research we engage in some specific local studies and surveys of rural people of Spanish origin. And, we undertake and publish analyses of Census data relating to this population. For example, the Economic Development Division is now preparing a report based on the Current Population Survey of December 1973 which will include national data on income and earnings of hired farmworkers by ethnic groups, including Americans of Spanish descent. In addition, we are studying migration of persons of Spanish origin in Arizona. However, the development and analysis of demographic data for intercensal periods in the research of our Department is based almost entirely on the national farm survey described above and the Current Population Survey and is limited in the detail that can be provided because of the size and design of those surveys.

In summary, I want to emphasize that the Department is concerned with the need for data regarding Americans of Spanish descent. If such data are to be obtained, we feel it would be more appropriate that the data be obtained through the expansion of the Current Population Survey. With substantial expansion of the Current Population Survey by the Bureau of the Census, the development of such data on a more frequent basis for subgroups of the population and for subareas which are meaningful in this Department may be feasible. If available, we would be interested in having such data for rural areas. However, we do not feel that this Department should collect the data because of the extra funding it would require and the fact that it would duplicate Census programs.

This concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

Mrs. Schroeder. Could you fill me in a little bit on the Department's use of statistics in other areas similar to this? You do get them from the Census Bureau? You don't do independent——

Mr. Motes. I'm not sure exactly why the Department of Agriculture was mentioned in the resolution. We do conduct surveys, but these are farm surveys. Our regular surveys are basically farm surveys. Let me read to you a little bit about that.

We conduct periodic national sample surveys of farms, and from these we identify the population residing on farms and the distribution of this population by location, by farm characteristics, and by characteristics of the farm operator. The racial categories we use are white, black, and all other. There is no major problem involved in adding a category for people of Spanish origin, but we have not added this category to the annual survey of farms and farm people because of the comparatively small number of persons of Spanish origin who live on farms.

Now, that is in reference to the surveys the Department conducts.

In addition to that, we do undertake a number of other research activities that include a small program of economic and social research—and that is the program that I am most directly concerned with.

The basis for our data in that program is mainly census data. The surveys that we conduct ourselves are small surveys, local surveys, dealing with usually a local problem.

Mrs. Schroeder. Wouldn't it be very easy to put on those surveys Spanish origin?

Mr. Motes. Yes, and we do focus directly on Spanish people when that is the appropriate focus of such a survey. We can leave you a list of studies that would be examples of how we have handled that in the past.

But our position is that for the purposes of this resolution these are too small; they are not adequate for the kind of thing that you had in mind; and that with regard to the major question we believe that one is mainly a census problem.

We would like to support it. We would like to see those data be better data. We observe as census does that the current population survey does not permit the identification of the place of origin of ethnic groups and other details by small areas, and we would like to see more rural detail so we could study those kinds of things. We believe that it is more appropriate to go through the CPS than it is for us to make independent surveys.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Does the gentlewoman from Maryland have anything she would like to add?

Mrs. SPELLMAN. No.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Counsel?

Mr. TERRY. I would just like to ask, Mr. Motes, when you were here testifying last year you said BLS was attempting to find ways to broaden its data base and was looking for new techniques that would permit both an increase of monthly data that can be provided as well as monthly publication of unemployment statistics of Spanish origin people. What has been the result of that?

Mr. MOTES. We have advocated they go in this direction, but we have not been as successful as we might be, as we would like to be.

Mr. TERRY. What is the problem? Money?

Mr. MOTES. Money is the problem.

Mr. TERRY. That's it? If you had the money you would do it?

Mr. MOTES. I can't answer that because I don't know the technical problems. BLS can speak to that. But I think money is the major problem. It is an expensive undertaking to extend a survey of this magnitude.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Any further questions?

Mrs. SPELLMAN. I have trouble, frankly, understanding what makes it so expensive. If you already are getting information, if you already have a questionnaire, then why is it expensive to add another question or two?

Mr. MOTES. It is expensive to add another question or two, but the major expense is not another question or two. It's increasing the size of the survey itself so that it permits you to say something about breakdowns by areas, and by population characteristics, below the regional level.

The finer the break, the more specific your detail is to be from the survey, the larger the survey must be, and it is increasing the size of the survey that is the principal element of cost.

Mrs. SPELLMAN. I see. You are not viewing this as being asked to take the same kind of survey with that additional information, but you view this as increasing the size of the survey.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You are also talking about parts of the country. In other words, I think you are saying the Spanish origin that are on farms are probably regionally isolated in a way?

Mr. MOTES. To some extent. The survey itself is designed for another purpose. It is designed to estimate employment and unemployment on a national basis. It is large enough to permit some regional breaks.

50-643--75——3

To increase the size of that survey enough so that you can say specific things about the national origin of people by, say, States or even smaller areas requires a substantial increase over the current size of the survey, therefore a major increase in cost.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I'm sure part of the thing a lot of people would like to know is the migrant worker force. Is there any way you can get that into your survey, or is that just too fluid?

Mr. MOTES. It's very difficult. The survey is a complicated survey. It involves a selection of families who are surveyed repeatedly for a period of time. They are in the survey for something like 16 months. They are in for 4 months, out for 8 months, in again, in a complicated statistical pattern of additional selection and followup. It is difficult to locate mobile people and difficult, particularly on a survey where the number is small relative to the total population, to be specific about small details of those large populations and about small areas.

Our concern, of course, is areas as well as people.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Simon?

Mr. SIMON. Yes.

As I glance through your statement—and my apologies for not being here when you gave the statement—you say, "In the conduct of our economic and social research we engage in some specific local studies and surveys of rural people of Spanish origin." I would really like to see more substantial data on taking these areas where the people of Spanish-speaking background locate and finding out information on earnings, health situation, housing situation, where they stand on the average. Is an 11-year-old who happens to be of Mexican background doing as well in school as an 11-year-old by the name of Smith who happens to live in the same community? That kind of thing should be expanded.

It seems to me if we could even just have half a dozen Spanish-speaking communities surveyed you would get a pretty accurate national picture. Is that not possible?

Mr. MOTES. Yes, sir. It is possible. We are a very small operation, and we do what we can in that connection. Our surveys have been largely rural or small-town oriented. But that kind of study with the limits of our funding is what we have in mind.

Mr. SIMON. Yes, and I am not suggesting that they be anything but rural and small-town oriented. I am concerned, and I assume that this subcommittee either today or at some future time will be getting into the same type of statistics on the urban Spanish-speaking. But as to the rural Spanish-speaking, like in Illinois where I happen to be acquainted, there are just really a few communities where it seems to me we could get pretty reliable statistics without a great deal of work on the part of your staff. It is easy for me to sit up here and say that, I realize. But I think that kind of thing would be very helpful, and I would personally appreciate having it.

Mr. MOTES. I will be glad to send you a copy of some of the things we have done in that regard. Our interests have been less statistical and more sociological and more economic. We have been more interested in going into more depth about the patterns of development and how people live in these kinds of communities than we have in counting people in the sense of the resolution. But I will send you what we have done.

Mr. SIMON. Good.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. May I ask a few more questions for my own information?

Mr. MOTES. Sure.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Then you are basically talking about the wage and hour law and the economic conditions and that type of thing? Do you have any correlation with the Justice Department and the Immigration Department as you are doing these surveys?

Mr. MOTES. I am not sure about the reference to the surveys. My principal occupation is research, and this is a small part of the Department. And we are concerned, as I said before, about this economic and social change, development patterns and forces faced by people in these small communities.

We are not in the survey business in the sense that Census is. The Department is in that business with regard to farms and we do publish statistics and data with regard to farms.

Now, our studies are not statistical or data publications in that sense.

I may not have answered your question.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think what I am trying to get at is in our part of the country the illegal alien problem has become a very acute problem, and I was wondering if your surveys had any bearing on that at all, or if you're staying away from that.

Mr. MOTES. Our surveys have not been designed to do that, and probably we would not undertake that. We would leave that to Immigration and Naturalization or others in the Department of Justice.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If there are no further questions, thank you very much.

The next witness is the Assistant Commissioner, Current Employment Analysis, in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Mr. Wetzel?

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. WETZEL, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, CURRENT EMPLOYMENT ANALYSIS, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. WETZEL. Thank you.

Madam Chairwoman, it is a pleasure to again appear before this subcommittee to discuss progress on the analytical and data production program of the Bureau of Labor Statistics with respect to the labor force characteristics of persons of Spanish origin.

In this morning's hearing what I would like to do is make just a few informal comments, but before doing so I would like to submit for the record our latest annual article on the status of Americans of Spanish origin and to submit for the committee's consideration the material submitted for the record in the last hearing.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That will be received for the use of the subcommittee.

Mr. WETZEL. With that I think I would like to just jump on to some informal comments about the changes in the employment status of Spanish Americans that have been observed in the past year, which, as you know, have been trying times for the U.S. economy.

Overall, nationally, in the period ending at the end of 1974, there was a substantial increase in the unemployment in the society as a

whole. When we look at that increase of unemployment by the racial and ethnic categories available to us, we discover that the rise of unemployment has been most pronounced in relative terms for black Americans.

The second most pronounced increase occurred among white Americans exclusive of those of Spanish origin.

And the third level of increase in the three subcategories we have available here was among Spanish Americans.

This relatively good performance among Americans of Spanish origin may be related to their concentration in particular geographic areas of the country and particular industries in the country which have not been as dramatically affected by the cutback in industrial production.

We hope to address those issues in a forthcoming article on the status of Spanish Americans, which is now in the initial stages of preparation and should be released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in May.

At this juncture, I think I would like to close out and ask for questions after restating the Bureau of Labor Statistics' essential position on the matter of improving the data base for this important minority group. We are willing and supportive and will do everything within the resource limitations faced by our organization to promote this desirable goal.

With that I would like to respond to questions.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The data base that you use in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, comes in essence from——

Mr. WETZEL. The Current Population Survey.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So you are getting it from the census?

Mr. WETZEL. That's correct, ma'am.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. And they are admitting indirectly that it is probably not too accurate.

Mr. WETZEL. I'm sorry, ma'am?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think they are admitting indirectly it's probably not too accurate on Spanish-speaking. So I am wondering if you do any kind of a change or any kind of undercount or——

Mr. WETZEL. Perhaps the institutional relationship should be explained here. The function of the Bureau of Labor Statistics with respect to these and other types of data dealing with ethnicity really is to report information that is collected and developed by others. Our expertise in this area is in the analytical side, not in the data collection side.

Now, we too, share, I am sure, the reservations of the expert statisticians employed at the Census Bureau, and because of their reservations and our own reservations we do not report these data on a monthly basis, only on a quarterly basis, which happens to be to meet certain statistical tests.

That situation, if you will, may be subject to some change sometime in 1976 for the following reason, and I expect Mr. Barabba spoke to this issue, and I apologize for not being here to hear his testimony.

We have, as a consequence of a number of actions, been able to initiate an expansion of the current population survey which will be taking place in the summer and fall of this year. That expansion is to

be concentrated in the more rural States in the country that tend to have a more sparse population distribution.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Would you tell us which States they are? Do you know which States they are?

Mr. WETZEL. I am not sure I can name them all, but they do include all the Southwestern States except California, which already has a comparatively large sample.

This sample increase, therefore, will pick up some areas in which we believe the Spanish population is concentrated, and all other surveys have suggested that these are areas of concentration.

When that sample expansion is in place, we will again evaluate the number of sample observations relative to the estimates of population for this group and again assess the merits of seasonal adjustment and the error associated with these estimates.

We have every reason to believe that the reliability of the monthly estimates will improve. The question is, How much will they improve? And we can't answer that until we have a basis of statistics to look at. We do not, however, modify in any way at the Bureau of Labor Statistics the basic output of the current population survey.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is what I was getting at, because I was wondering if that is why maybe your unemployment statistics were the way they were for the Spanish-origin people. If they were undercounted your unemployment statistics could be off on that basis, could they not?

Mr. WETZEL. All estimates for all groups, regardless of how they are partitioned, are subject to a certain error of estimate due to the sampling. And the level of estimate would directly reflect any over- or undercount of that population group.

So to the extent that one is able to establish an over- or under-count, in fact, they would be over- or under-counted.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I hope you add that as a footnote when you write your paper.

Mr. WETZEL. I would be happy to.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Does anybody else have a question?

Mr. SIMON. Just an observation. Again, this speaks, I guess, from a little bit of provincial outlook. In the State of Illinois we have perhaps 600,000 people of Spanish-speaking background, largely Mexican and Puerto Rican. They do not have a single member in the State legislature or a single member in the Chicago city council. That means that it is particularly important for Federal agencies to accurately monitor what is going on in these communities so that we can respond to the needs that sometimes are not articulated in governmental bodies, because these groups are not represented there, or not represented by people of either Mexican or Puerto Rican background.

I think it is extremely important in a State like Illinois—in my district in southern Illinois there are very, very few of Spanish background—which you don't think of as having a great many people of Spanish-speaking background. However, we have almost twice as many people of Spanish-speaking background than does the State of New Mexico, for example.

So, it is important to keep statistics, at least for an area like ours. It is important not only just because of the numerical importance but

because of the lack of having people to speak for them in governmental bodies.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you. I am sorry I was late.

We have a Spanish language problem in Miami that is a little different from either Chicago or the Southwest. We have the influx of Cubans.

It is very interesting that 5 years ago when I was on the school board, or approximately 5 years ago, they stopped the freedom flights and we were supposed to be able to estimate there would be less and less Cuban-born schoolchildren in our public school enrollment. We are getting assistance for 5 years for every Cuban-born child that we enroll in the public schools for the first 5 years of his time in this country.

You would think that by now we would be out of Cuban-born children in our school system with the cessation of the freedom flights. Today we have more Cuban-born children in our school system than we did 5 years ago.

The reason for that is that the Cuban-born children are coming in from Mexico and Spain.

I just wanted to put you on notice in a sense that we have, despite the lack of freedom flights, a still rapidly expanding Spanish-speaking population in south Florida that is going to have to be counted and it is going to have to be accounted for. It is continuing to expand. And not only are the Cubans there—you have spoken of Puerto Ricans, you have spoken of Mexican Americans—but we are getting a rapidly growing segment of Central Americans.

Now with the prosperity in Venezuela we are getting a lot of people from Venezuela. I don't know whether you would count them as residents or not, but their kids live in Miami, and their families are moving to Miami. And also from Colombia and other parts of South America.

So if you would break the community down in Miami, the Spanish-speaking portion is probably greater than the so-called Anglo portion and certainly greater than the black and Jewish population in Miami.

I just want to let you know that the school enrollment of Cuban-born, not counting the American-born children of Cuban parents that are also non-English-speaking and who are coming into our school system, would be going down but it is growing.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you.

I wanted to ask one more question as we hear how many Spanish-speaking everyone has in their area. Will the expansion this summer allow monthly publication of unemployment data on Spanish-origin people?

Mr. WETZEL. We are hopeful that will be the case, but we really need to take a look at the figures.

There is an elaborate statistical test which I must confess I am not sure I understand which essentially certifies to the publishability, the analytical usefulness, if you will, of data on a monthly basis for a particular group, and I am not going to try to explain that to you. It has something to do with months of cyclical dominance and an elaborate test of irregulars.

The sample expansion is such, however, that we can have high hopes that monthly data will be publishable, and you may be assured that the moment we get a go signal we will, in fact, begin monthly publication.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But you still are not sure whether Spanish-origin people will be——

Mr. WETZEL. I have learned in statistical systems not to speak with certainty until I have the facts in hand. We had at one time believed it might be possible to tabulate annual regional data, to address some of these questions of what is the situation in the Midwest vis-a-vis the South, and, in fact, our suppositions proved incorrect.

But with the sample expansion we can again look at all the parameters, all the constraints operating on our reporting program, and I think a number of them will be changed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I hope that that is included.

I would like to welcome the ranking minority member here and wish him a happy Earth Day.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gracious recognition. My shuffling between four committees today is a fantastic logistical problem.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I haven't really had a chance to totally go through them. Are there any potential defects in the legislation that you see?

Mr. WETZEL. Well, that's actually a difficult question to ask the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I know you have studied it and that most of us are very sympathetic to the legislation. Do you see any potential defects that we should concern ourselves with?

Mr. WETZEL. I think both personally and for the institution I can say that we are supportive of the general principles articulated in this resolution, and further we have at various points in time reprogramed or made arrangements to begin to move to meet some of these goals.

Existing publication of data, for example, arises from a cooperative relationship with the Manpower Administration which is really a special temporary arrangement. I must in all fairness point out, however, that we are facing certain resource constraints.

The reason that we do not have monthly publication, as the chairwoman was indicating, is that the sample is not sufficiently large in the current population survey to give us reliable estimates. When I testified last year we submitted certain data on what might be an appropriate size sample, and we now, because of other reasons, are going to get a sample expansion. But I cannot sit here today and guarantee that the Bureau of Labor Statistics will be in a position to publish monthly data in the future. I can offer a hope that we will.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is that all cost? Or just field capability? What's the problem?

Mr. WETZEL. Well, there are a variety of limitations on any statistical system, but in this instance the primary constraint is the size of the sample.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. It's too big?

Mr. WETZEL. It's too small. The required sample is far in excess of the resources that are available for this multipurpose activity.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is that personnel, or finance, or both?

Mr. WETZEL. Both.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Both? It's both personnel and finance for you?

Mr. WETZEL. That's correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And the Census Bureau?

Mr. WETZEL. That's correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Can you estimate what that is? Let's suppose we gave you both the personnel and the funding. What would it be?

Mr. WETZEL. Mr. Barabba testified this morning on the subject of the sample size, and I confess my ignorance of the exact kinds of requirements. The way the BLS operates in this area is under a contractual relationship with the Bureau of the Census. I can't tell you what the exact sample shortfall would be—indeed whether there is going to be a shortfall one year from now when this committee again addresses the issue of the quality and frequency of these statistics.

I would hope that a year from now I can come to you and say because of other activities we are going to be in a position to provide what you want.

In the interim I have to turn the question back to the Census Bureau which is the only organization that can state with certainty what size sample or even with reasonable certainty what size sample would be appropriate here.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. What I'm asking from you is from your viewpoint, the Department of Labor viewpoint, if you could give us what you think would be the additional requirement of personnel or contractual authority on the part of the Census Bureau and funding in order to adequately carry out the provisions of the bill. I'd like to know that.

Mr. WETZEL. Well, I can't give it to you verbally at this moment.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. No. I mean would you be willing to write it—say, within the next week or something like that—to us?

Mr. WETZEL. I can ask the Census Bureau to give us a cost estimate of what they would require to do that and I would be happy to do so.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. All right. Are there no additional personnel and funding problems then really from your standpoint? You contract it all to the Census Bureau?

Mr. WETZEL. Well, I am sure our needs would be minimal in comparison to the real sampling need.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I would appreciate that.

Mr. WETZEL. Thank you.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Congressman Roybal from California, who is the originator of this resolution. Welcome, Mr. Roybal.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL, A MEMBER IN CONGRESS FROM CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman.

I am here today to discuss a matter of continuing concern to me, and that is the lack of census based data on Americans of Spanish origin.

I consider the passage of my proposal, House Joint Resolution 92, essential to the accurate reporting of social and economic conditions

confronting Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and others of Spani[illegible] origin in the country today.

The Spanish-origin population of this Nation has long been misunderstood. It has been ignored, undercounted, and excluded. It has been ignored by the Federal Government in various fields—for example, in the fields of health, education, and employment.

For instance, the National Center for Health Statistics in HEW does not provide reliable estimates on health problems facing Spanish-speaking Americans even though it has acknowledged that Mexican Americans may have high rates of A, C, and D and protein deficiencies.

It has admitted that the Spanish speaking suffer from chronic health problems due to the lack of the most simple and ordinary health facilities.

The National Center for Educational Statistics also in HEW does not even collect ethnic or racial data, although it has the responsibility for preparing the definitions used by schools to report compliance with civil rights laws.

Further, the Commerce Department has failed to conduct voting and registration surveys on the basis of race and national origin, despite the fact that it is mandated to do so under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Speaking of civil rights, I feel that the civil rights of the Spanish-speaking community of the United States have been ignored by the Federal Government.

For an example, in the field of employment, the Spanish speaking have gained only three-tenths of 1 percent in Federal employment in the last 10 years, even though we have a Civil Rights Commission, an Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, and all the various agencies that this Congress has mandated that no American suffers discrimination.

I feel also that the Spnish-speaking community has been ignored insofar as Federal programs are concerned. As we go throughout the Nation, we find that the moneys made available by the Congress of the United States are actually not trickling down proportionately to the Spanish-speaking community of this Nation.

They have been excluded also from Federal data information banks on matters of social and economic significance.

I believe that they have been misunderstood, for they don't know who we are nor where we really belong.

Most people think that the Spanish-speaking community of this Nation is concentrated in the Southwestern States. This is not the fact at all, for only 40 percent of the Spanish-speaking community of the United States live in the Southwestern States of this Nation. The other 60 percent are throughout the various 50 States.

I know that we are undercounted, as has already been demonstrated by the last census. Perhaps we were not considered by uniform standards of the census-taking process. The result of that count was that we were estimated to be 9 million people in the whole country, and it became quite evident that this was inaccurate.

It was inaccurate, first of all, because they did not use the process of self-determination. In other words, they did not go out to talk to people themselves to ask them what their ethnic background really was.

50-643—75——4

They looked at what they felt was a Spanish surname. But how can someone who doesn't even know what a Spanish-speaking person even looks like possibly make a final determination that that Spanish-speaking person is indeed a member of that ethnic group?

I take myself for an example. The name "Roybal" to most anyone is not a Spanish name. But it is a Spanish name to those of us who come from the Southwest who are of Mexican descent and who are Spanish-speaking, but it may not to anyone else who is not.

The census of 1970 became a most inaccurate census, and resulted in various organizations denouncing it. For an example, a report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights attested to the significant undercount of the Spanish-origin population and alluded to the Census Bureau's insensitivity in developing methods to accurately count the Spanish-origin community.

In a 1973 report the National Urban League further documented a larger undercount rate for the Spanish-speaking minority than for the blacks. Now, this was quite a finding for this organization to make, to highlight the fact that another minority group had been treated equally as bad.

As I look at the situation, I say to myself: How could they have made a better count when the Census Bureau, for an example, has very few Spanish-speaking people in their employ? Their percentage rate is 1.3 percent, which is much lower than the national average. And I feel that the national average is most disgraceful, at its present level of 3.1 percent. But the Census Bureau has only 1.3 percent.

They used few bilingual materials when they went out to try to determine how many Spanish-speaking there were in the United States. Their enumerators for the most part did not speak Spanish. So, how, then, could they actually find out what the real situation is?

This resulted in various organizations making independent surveys, and there was one that was more conservative than the others. The Mexican American Population Commission estimated there were 12 million Spanish-speaking people in the United States.

But then the Bureau of the Census after many letters and after a lot of pressure finally decided to recount and find out just exactly what the situation was and that effort resulted in their report of 1973. They reported that the Spanish-speaking population of the United States increased by 17 percent. The Mexican Americans in this Nation increased by 40 percent—again prima facie evidence to the fact that the original count was not accurate, that it was not done properly.

The legislation that we have before us would establish a collection of comprehensive data on a regular and national basis.

It will provide for extensive surveys to determine various social and economic criteria.

It will authorize the Department of Labor to determine the feasibility of a monthly employment rate.

It would develop governmentwide programs for Spanish-origin data materials.

It would also develop reliable means of determining undercount statistics for future use in census-taking.

It would develop and use bilingual questionnaires and enumerators in the collection of census data.

I feel that one of the most important things that it provides is the implementation of an aggressive program of affirmative action for the employment of Spanish-origin personnel in the census-related agencies of the Government of the United States.

Only through defining the Spanish-origin population all over the United States to the greatest degree of accuracy possible and expanding Government programs to meet its needs can the second largest minority in the United States be adequately served.

I think the legislation that you have before you, once enacted, once passed by the Congress of the United States, will serve as the necessary vehicle needed to ameliorate the inequity that has existed for so many years.

I thank you for your attention.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, Congressman Roybal. I think that that was a very eloquent statement, and we certainly appreciate your continuing to have patience enough to keep pushing on this.

I hope maybe this year we will finally get this thing through and maybe get some implementation underway.

I was especially glad to hear you reiterate the need and the importance you felt about section 5 of your bill, which was the bilingual questionnaires and enumerators, and an aggressive affirmative action program for the employment of personnel of Spanish descent in the Census Bureau. Because I think that was the one point that the Director of the Census Bureau took issue with in the bill.

He wasn't too pleased with section 5 and felt maybe that the bilingual questionnaires were not needed and that the affirmative action program was not needed because they were under equal employment.

Do you have any further comment or would you like to say anything about that?

Mr. ROYBAL. Probably one of complaint. It has not been possible for most agencies of the Federal Government to look at the situation the way it is. They feel that by sending some stranger to a barrio, who may not know or care for the community that this is complying with the law itself. It may be, but on the other hand, the efficiency of that individual is just not manifested by the results that he gets. He can't possibly communicate with someone he doesn't understand.

It seems to me that if the Census Bureau is going to do the job that it shouldn't at least in Spanish-speaking areas shouldn't send a non-Spanish-speaking person.

If they do not have any in their employ, they should at least seek the help of people in the community that are willing to help them. They have not done this, of course. As a result, what they have done has not been adequate, and they have admitted that by the mere fact that they went back again to recount and came back with a higher count just 1½ years later.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I appreciate that very much.

I also like your comments about surnames, because women have a particular problem, too. How did they take into account that a woman may be of Spanish origin but have another name?

Mr. ROYBAL. Well, they didn't. In the final census that they took they used a so-called 5-percent sampling and did not use the process of self-determination. This is the only process I think that will actually reveal the true background of that individual.

I realize that not everyone in a particular community is going to be counted, but, nevertheless, those that are counted can be given an opportunity to state what they really are.

Now, again, I will use myself as an example. The name "Roybal" to some may not indicate my ethnic background. The correct pronunciation of the name is "Roybál," but it has been "Roybal" for many years. Our family settled in Santa Fe in 1500 and——

Mr. SIMON. It's been so long ago you have forgotten?

[Laughter.]

Mr. ROYBAL. I want to be accurate because it was 10 years before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. 1620.

Mr. ROYBAL. Ten years before was 1610, so we were here many years before.

The name is known particularly in the Southwest, among Spanish-speaking people, but it is not known to those who are not Spanish-speaking. So it is a good example of how I could be missed in the taking of the census.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. If the chairlady would yield.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I can assure my colleagues the name is well known in southern California. People are afraid to run against him.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. He also hides his age well. [Laughter.]

On the name, I know I talked to one of the enumerators out in our part of the country. His name is Farandao, and he thought the Spanish-origin people would welcome him as a brother. And he was only shocked to find out they didn't recognize the name at all. It was like Jones or Smith. Because obviously it wasn't but he figured it was Latin origin, and therefore it should be.

So I think that shows some of the real naivete.

Do you have any questions?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes; I do.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Have at them.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

I am delighted that my colleague from California is here and is again presenting this bill. His dedication of purpose is extremely commendable. And as one who fights for many causes that sometimes don't get attention, I appreciate the gentleman's persistence and can attest to his genuine long-term interest in the whole subject, not only in Congress but also here in the Federal Government.

I have this question, because we are sometimes confronted with it, as people may, maybe should, know but don't. You have made it clear in your bill that you believe the designation should be, as a reference point, Americans of Spanish origin and descent. And you repeat that in each one of the sections. Is that the generally accepted terminology?

Because sometimes we are confronted with, "We ought to call it Chicano" or something else.

Now, can you comment on that so that we make sure that we are properly identified in the kind of information we are seeking?

Mr. ROYBAL. I believe that term is the most readily accepted. There are differences of opinion throughout the Southwest, and there have been differences for many years. For an example, those that come from the State of New Mexico, while we are in New Mexico refer

to themselves as Spanish Americans. The same thing is true in Colorado. In Texas they are Latin Americans. In California they are Mexican Americans.

But the term used in the bill is one that I believe to be more readily acceptable by all groups insofar as legislation is concerned.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. The reason I raise that issue here is because so many times we get into the substitute issues, which are really far more important than the terminology, and I would hate to get to the floor and have somebody stand up and say, "It really should be named something else."

So we can be generally assured that most organizations interested in this legislation have generally—although there are some differences, as you have stated—accepted this terminology?

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes. And I base that on the fact that I have taken the precaution to check with various organizations, and I find that it is acceptable.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

I notice that the gentleman has mentioned that the problems that exist in the fields of education, health, and employment are substantial in these groups and can be so identified if we have the capability of gathering that information at the Federal level. And he mentioned certain health problems, such as protein deficiency and that kind of thing.

Are they peculiar to people of Spanish American heritage or does it exist for most groups in our country? Are there particular kinds of health problems, for instance?

Mr. ROYBAL. I don't believe there are any particular health problems one can attribute to the Spanish speaking. I think it is mostly a matter of the sociological condition in which the person happens to live.

Again looking at the overall economic picture of the Spanish speaking, we find that, including the Federal Government, they seem to be the last hired and first fired. The opportunities are not there.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You mean in Federal employment?

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes, sir. I think that the Federal Government is most discriminatory when it comes to the Spanish-speaking community of this Nation, and that can definitely be substantiated by statistics that have already been made available.

Second, I find that this large group of Americans doesn't seem to be included when we talk about civil rights and equal employment opportunities.

I think that our own commissions, including the Civil Rights Commission and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, are not cognizant of the fact that they too may be discriminatory in this instance.

The end result is that the unemployment rate in the Spanish-speaking communities is very, very high.

Because of this particular condition we find they have certain diet deficiencies as they are unable to buy the proper food that will provide the vitamins that are necessary to actually maintain a strong and healthy body.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And you believe that census gathering in this area will help determine if, in fact, those complaints or concerns are real or just imaginary? That's why you are saying that we need to do it?

Mr. ROYBAL. We need to do it because we try to provide for the needs of people all over the world, and neglect people living in our own backyard.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I don't think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. ROYBAL. I think that by getting this type of statistics that perhaps we can address ourselves to some of these problems.

Now, very few people realize—at least it is apparent to me anyway—that this is the second largest minority in the United States.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You and I do.

Mr. ROYBAL. You and I do because we come from an area where we are exposed to it. But some of our colleagues do not. And it seems to me that by the gathering of proper statistics we will be able to show that there is a certain deficiency existing that is discriminatory and really not in keeping with our main objective of trying to improve the life and status of our American population.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Madam Chairwoman, I have some other questions but I will defer because I am sure my time is up. But let me just say this. I have found that in our area in southern California the Spanish-American community or people that want to identify themselves in that way probably ask less from the Federal Government, make fewer demands on elected officials than any other group of which I know.

I think the gentleman is to be complimented for his desire to try to find accurate statistics and findings so that Congress can act more responsibly when it deals with these various problems of education, health and employment or civil rights, as the gentleman mentions, and I appreciate his persistence.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you.

Congressman Lehman?

Mr. LEHMAN. I just want to thank our colleague, Mr. Roybal, for coming in here and bringing us the kind of information and background he has on the Spanish-origin population, and I just hope that in his support of this legislation he keeps in mind our problem in south Florida in regard to the overwhelming number of Cuban descent in relation to other kinds of Spanish-origin population and their special problems that are somewhat different from the Spanish-speaking people throughout the rest of the country.

We have even three different classes I guess. We have American-born Cuban population. We have the naturalized Cuban population. And we have the parolee Cuban population. And we have a little different kind of problems and benefits resulting from these different areas of growth in our Spanish-origin population.

We even have Cuban families move to Spain, have children, and the children come back to south Florida. We have Spanish-origin, Spanish-born children that wouldn't even qualify under this bill. So we do have some different kinds of situations.

Thank you very much.

Mr. ROYBAL. May I respond just briefly to that? I am quite aware of the problems you are talking about. I have in my district many people who came from Cuba. In fact, my district is made up of people of various ethnic backgrounds, and the Cuban, of course, is of Spanish descent and would be included in legislation that would make it possible for them to have self-determination as they are being counted.

Mr. LEHMAN. But—it's just nitpicking in a way—I was trying to think of a Cuban couple that went to Spain to escape from the Castro regime, had a child in Spain, which would be a Spanish national, and then came with his parents to Miami. He would not be under this. This child would not be under this provision a countable person.

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes, he would, because he would be a Spanish——

Mr. LEHMAN. He could not trace his origin or descent. Would he be in?

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes, he would.

Mr. LEHMAN. OK. Because I thought it would be just people in the Western Hemisphere born of Spanish descent.

Mr. ROYBAL. No. Anyone of Spanish descent in the United States can be counted and come under this legislation.

Mr. LEHMAN. OK. Thank you.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. Simon?

Mr. SIMON. First of all, it is an excellent statement, and I appreciate it.

Just a few personal observations in support of what you have to say. I recall, after the 1970 census, being on a Chicago television program where one of the local Puerto Rican leaders by the name of Gregory Mirando said on television, "If you're Puerto Rican, don't fill out the census form because they don't recognize us." And obviously there were a great many people who either because of that message or because of lack of bilingual personnel and forms did not fill them out.

In Illinois the highest dropout rate we have of any ethnic group from high school is among our Puerto Rican and Mexican background youngsters.

I was Lieutenant Governor in Illinois for a brief time, and I called a meeting of the State universities asking what they were doing to be of assistance. The answer was, at that point, they were doing nothing. I would guess that the Illinois universities are not atypical in that regard.

I think that anything we can do to create a greater sensitivity to this problem has to be a step forward. I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. ROYBAL. You are correct in your statement when you say you assume that the same thing is true elsewhere. It is true. There seems to be a situation where the Spanish-speaking youngster starting out in the junior college level particularly does not plan to prepare to enter government.

I had a meeting with students at several of the schools in my area, and when I mentioned the possibility of a government career, the answer was, "What for? They won't hire us anyway so why prepare for something we are not going to get?"

This attitude that prevails at the moment is due to the fact that there is a lack of affirmative action being applied on the part of the Federal Government.

Again if we go back to statistics, we find this to definitely be the truth.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SIMON. I certainly will.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Does our colleague feel that is specifically because of their Spanish origin that that resistance exists at the Federal level in employment?

Mr. ROYBAL. No, I don't think it's because of Spanish origin. I think that it's because people who are in command feel that they meet the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, and equal employment opportunities, by reporting to our committees that, "We have hired many minorities." "Our percentage has increased in the last few years."

But then when we ask how many Spanish-surnamed Americans they have hired we find that their reference to minorities does not necessarily include Spanish-speaking.

We find that the Spanish-surname individual has been almost completely ignored and that the so-called minority increase is made up of other minorities, not the Spanish-speaking individual.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is it possible that part of the problem is that those who are of Spanish origin don't necessarily identify themselves that way when they are hired or when they are in place?

Mr. ROYBAL. I don't think that is the case at all. I think it is just a case of the individual employer not making an effort to get Spanish-speaking people on their staff.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. It's just an apathy and a lack of understanding?

Mr. ROYBAL. It is an attitude based on a lack of understanding.

Mr. SIMON. If I could comment there, my feeling just from my limited observation is it is not an attitude of hostility but just a failure to comprehend, a lack of sensitivity to the situation, that accurate census figures could appreciably help.

Mr. ROYBAL. That is correct.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Any further questions?

Mr. ROYBAL. Madam Chairwoman, I also have a prepared statement. May I present it now for the record?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am glad to know you are a "text deviate," as I am.

Thank you very much. We are glad to put it in the record.

[The statement referred to follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Madame Chairperson, I am here today to discuss a matter of continuing concern to me—the lack of census based data on Americans of Spanish origin. I consider the passage of my proposed bill, House Joint Resolution 92, essential to the accurate reporting of social and economic conditions confronting Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and others of Spanish origin in this country today.

The Spanish origin population of this nation has long been misunderstood, ignored, and undercounted. It has been excluded from Federal data information banks in matter of crucial social and economic significance. Major discrepancies in population counts, a principal determinant of need for federal programs and assistance, have deprived the Spanish origin population of necessary resources and support.

It is time that Spanish speaking Americans be fully and accurately represented. Federal agencies continue to ignore the distinct ethnic and cultural heritage of the Spanish origin population as a group by their continual reliance on the Caucasian and Black classifications. The Spanish origin population is thus buried in a category which summarily denies the extent of its problems and needs. Moreover, the problem of accurate census representation is one of national, not merely regional, scope. The Spanish origin population is represented in every region of the United States as well as in the Southwest and Northeast.

Far from acknowledging these facts, the Census Bureau has pursued inaccurate methods of determining Spanish origin population. Persons of Spanish origin were not even considered by a uniform standard in the census taking process until 1970. As I have stated in previous testimony on this matter, standards such as surname, language, birth or parentage, do not provide accurate classification of persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and other Spanish speaking backgrounds. Yet, the most reliable common denominator, that of Spanish origin self-determination, was asked of only a token 5 percent of the population, and that measure was provided only as a concession to demands from Spanish speaking groups. Insufficient effort was made at the time of this census to develop bilingual or bicultural methods for obtaining census materials from the Spanish origin population. The Bureau showed insensitivity in its hiring practices, failing to employ adequate numbers of bilingual enumerators and community specialists who had the trust and support of the Latino community.

Thus, the results of the 1970 Census were far from accurate. After the completion of the census and publication of the results, obvious inadequacies in the figures pertaining to the Spanish origin population led to several independent surveys. The Mexican American Population Commission estimated the Spanish origin population at over 12 million persons as compared to the Bureau's estimate of just over 9 million. A report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights attested to a "significant undercount" of the Spanish origin population and alluded to the Census Bureau's "insensitivity" in developing methods to accurately count Spanish origin communities. In a 1973 report, the National Urban League further documented a larger undercount rate for the Spanish origin minority than for the Blacks.

While the Census Bureau has been under continual attack for its erroneous representation of the Spanish origin population, those of Spanish origin who are employed by the Social and Economic Statistics Administration, the umbrella agency covering Census Bureau activities, constitute a mere 1.3 percent of the agency's staff, a figure which has not been altered since last year's testimony on this very same subject. The number of those employees in executive positions at the higher GS levels remains even more minute.

The Census Bureau has taken the position that without complete data on births, deaths, and net immigration, it cannot prepare accurate undercount statistics for persons of Spanish origin. There exist a number of possible sources: the Immigration and Naturalization Service data on the nationality of Immigrants, available statistics on the migration of Puerto Ricans to the mainland, statistics on Spanish surnamed from the five Southwestern States, and various school enrollment and employment data kept by Federal, State, and local agencies.

After much criticism of the so-called "census count" of 1970, the Census Bureau compiled a special report in 1973 dealing with persons of Spanish origin. The report amounted to a retraction of the 1970 census figures, documenting astronomical leaps in population such as 17 percent for the Spanish origin group, and an increase of nearly 40 percent for those of Mexican American background.

The consequences of an undercount are extremely serious, and involves constitutional issues of due process and equal opportunity. For one, an undercount encroaches on the voting rights of a constituency. It affects not only reapportionment but the very right to vote as protected by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments and further by recent court decisions mandating bilingual elections. Further, an undercount affects a wide spectrum of Federal assistance programs which depend on racial and ethnic data to determine need, including the Civil Rights Act, general revenue sharing, equal employment opportunity, comprehensive employment and training, adult and vocational education, elementary and secondary education, housing and economic opportunity.

The Census Bureau has the Constitutional mandate to compile and publish accurate data on U.S. population. There is little doubt that governmental agencies at all levels rely heavily, and in many cases exclusively, on data developed by the Bureau. This dependency has its own domino effect, particularly in the case of HEW, Labor and Agriculture, agencies directly affected by their own statistical reports and interpretations. If Bureau figures are suspect, then theirs and those of other agencies are also suspect.

This conclusion applies particularly to the area of health and educational statistics as collected and analyzed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For instance, the National Center of Health Statistics in HEW does not provide reliable estimates on health problems facing Spanish speaking Americans, even though it has been acknowledged that Mexican Americans may

50-643—75——5

have high rates of vitamin A, C, D, and protein deficiencies. It is also admitted that the Spanish speaking suffer from chronic health problems due to lack of the most simple and ordinary health facilities.

The National Center for Educational Statistics, also in HEW, does not even collect ethnic or racial data, although it has responsibility for preparing the definitions used by schools to report compliance with civil rights laws.

Further, the Commerce Department has failed to conduct voting and registration surveys on the basis of race and national origin despite the fact that it is mandated to do so under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This omission is extremely serious in light of current efforts to protect the right to vote of Spanish speaking Americans in the extension of the Voting Rights Act.

What is clearly needed is an overall approach involving the resources and commitment of OMB and the various data gathering agencies, particularly those involving the Departments of Commerce, HEW, Labor, and HUD, and the Community Services Administration. Further, this cooperative interagency approach must provide for the development of an ongoing program for describing the social, health, economic, and educational problems facing Spanish speaking groups, and for evaluating, on the basis of this data, the delivery of services, program resources, and employment opportunities for the Spanish speaking. The Office of Management and Budget's role in this data-gathering and review process is especially critical and is recognized within the provisions of my bill. Under the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act, OMB has the responsibility of setting guidelines for the "improved" gathering and publication of federal statistics.

The bill I have introduced mandates the collection of comprehensive data on the Spanish origin population on a regular basis: Section 1 provides that the Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, determine the feasibility and cost of publishing a monthly, in addition to quarterly, nationwide unemployment rate for Americans of Spanish origin. Section 2 provides that the Departments of Labor and Agriculture and the Bureau of the Census undertake further efforts to collect and publish regularly social and economic data on Spanish origin Americans. Section 3 requires that the Office of Management and Budget, working with the Director of the Bureau of the Census, and other federal data collecting agencies, develop a government wide effort to collect data on Spanish origin Americans. Section 4 provides that the Bureau of the Census undertake a study to develop creditable undercount estimates in future censuses. Section 5 mandates that the Bureau of the Census use bilingual questionnaires and enumerators in the collection of data; and that it implement an "aggressive affirmative action program" for the employment of Spanish origin personnel.

The adoption of these measures is essential if the Spanish origin population is to overcome its "invisibility" and consequent neglect within the Federal government. These steps, however, are but the beginning of what must be an all-out effort to reverse the thinking which has allowed the Census Bureau and other data gathering agencies to ignore their responsibilities and to distort the public's view of the Spanish origin population. Only when these measures and similar efforts toward accuracy are effected can the nation as a whole, and those instruments of government which provide resources and assistance, recognize the special problems and concerns of the Spanish origin population. Only through defining that population to the greatest degree of accuracy possible and expanding government programs to meet its needs, can that population best be served.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I also want to make a note—and I think this is really kind of sad—that the Census people have left. I don't know about anybody else, but I'd love to be able to recall them at this point. They always want to testify first and leave. But I would like to have that in the record. Is there someone here——

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am Edward Fernandez. I am Chief of the Spanish Statistics Staff.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Could you make some comments?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Could you come up to the microphone?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. My understanding from the Director's testimony was that he was not too pleased with section 5, and after listening to Congressman Roybal I think he makes a very good case for section 5.

Is it the economic impact of section 5? Or do you have anything you could tell us?

STATEMENT OF EDWARD FERNANDEZ, CHIEF, SPANISH STATISTICS STAFF, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is the implication in section 5 that the Census Bureau did not have any Spanish questionnaires or instructions in Spanish when the census of 1970 was taken. And that was not the case.

In 14 temporary census districts, when the 1970 census was taken, there were instructions in Spanish sent to all the district offices, and there were Spanish questionnaires given to the enumerators that went to the households for those households that received the sample questionnaires.

So in a good number of the areas of the country where the Spanish-origin population was predominant, there were instructions in Spanish available to the respondents if they did not understand the English questionnaire, and the enumerators also had a literal translation of the English questionnaire.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Fourteen districts out of how many?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. 212.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is not too big a sample.

Let me ask you another question. How many Spanish-speaking people are currently employed by the Bureau of the Census? What percentage?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. About 1.7 percent.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Do you know where most of them are?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. You mean——

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Locationwise.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. What positions, you mean?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No. I know a few personally, some in the agricultural division, some in the population division like myself, and some in personnel.

The Census Bureau does have a Spanish-speaking coordinator who is located in the personnel division.

They are scattered throughout the Bureau.

One point that I might add though is that in hiring persons of Spanish origin the Bureau of the Census is located in Suitland, Md., and the particular proportion of Spanish in the area, persons of Spanish origin or descent in the area, of course, is not representative of the Spanish-origin population in the United States.

I venture to feel—totally informally—that maybe this is one of the reasons why the Bureau does not reach, in its employment, the proportion of the Spanish-origin persons in the United States.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. If the gentlewoman would yield.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. How about in those areas where there are substantial population percentages? Say southern California, New Mexico, and so on.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. About Federal employment in those areas I wouldn't know.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. No; in the Census Bureau.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. You mean about persons from those areas?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Well, it could be that some of those persons do not wish to relocate and work in an agency such as this.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. No; but I mean are they in place in those areas where the Spanish-origin population is high?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. You mean—I don't really understand your question.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Well, enumerators, that you have in the field.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Oh, I understand; yes. For censustaking, the procedures that the Census Bureau uses for hiring interviewers go down to the local level. In other words, interviewers are hired from the particular local level in which the census is being taken. And tests are given.

I don't know the exact particulars, but I do know that it's the local area people who are offered the opportunity of being interviewers. Therefore, if the proportion of an area is predominantly Spanish, the proportion of the interviewers logically would also be Spanish and thus be bilingual and know about the cultural situation of the area.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Do you have any statistics to back that up?

Excuse me one second. I think Congressman Roybal probably has to go. If you do, certainly do, please.

Mr. ROYBAL. I wish I had time to rebut what the gentleman is saying, particularly with regard to the State of California where in that State we have a Spanish-speaking population that is 16 to 20 percent. Still in Federal employ we have less than 7 percent, clearly reflecting the fact that even in an area that has a very large Spanish-speaking population, larger than any place else in the United States, that the rate of employment of Spanish-speaking people is relatively low compared to other ethnic groups. Again a clear indication that more effort must be made by the Bureau of the Census and other departments of the Federal Government to get more Spanish-speaking people involved in Government work.

I think it is not only incumbent upon them to do so but very beneficial to the efficiency of their operation.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you.

I would wonder too if you already have these bilingual questionnaires prepared.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes. I have examples of the instructions for filling out the 1970 questionnaires and also an example of a questionnaire translated into Spanish.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I would think it would be very simple or would not be very expensive to contiue with that kind of bilingual questionnaire and expand it into more than 14 out of 212.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The particular district offices for which these questionnaires were mailed were the ones predominantly Spanish in the country. Census instruction sheets in Spanish and Spanish-translated questionnaires were sent to district offices in Los Angeles, Calif.; Miami, Fla.; Phoenix, Ariz.; San Antonio, Tex.; and in New York

State to district offices in the boroughs of the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Manhattan.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think we would like the lists and we would probably like samples of the questionnaires, and if you have the statistics of how many Spanish-speaking people you hired to do the census in 1970 that would be very helpful.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Offhand, I am not sure those statistics exist. I don't think a specific analysis of the origin of the enumerators was made.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Was it taken for the blacks?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I don't know.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I would also like to know how the 14 districts were selected, because I do believe it was the Census Bureau's position that the 1960 census was much worse than the 1970 census, so I would like to know, when they admit the 1960 census really did not reflect at all the Spanish-speaking, or very poorly reflected it, how they could then use their own statistics to select the 14 areas to go to.

[The following information was furnished:]

The 1970 Census of Population and Housing was conducted through 393 temporary district offices across the country. In 212 of these offices (generally those in the larger metropolitan areas), the census was taken by the mail-out/mail-back system. The census questionnaire envelope mailed out to each housing unit in 14 of those offices contained a Spanish-language version of the instruction sheet (Form D–4s or D–5s). These offices were selected on the basis of the relative concentration of "Spanish" persons in the area as determined from the best data available in 1969; that is, 1960 census statistics updated by current local information. Altogether, of the approximately 43 million addresses covered by the mail system, about 2.5 million received a Spanish-language instruction sheet. The 14 offices were located as follows:

Location:	*Number of district Offices*
Total	14
Los Angeles, Calif.	1
Miami, Fla.	1
Bronx, N.Y.	2
Brooklyn, N.Y.	4
Manhattan, N.Y.	4
Phoenix, Ariz.	1
San Antonio, Tex.	1

Elsewhere, a form in Spanish (Form D–61S) which included examples of the various questions and directions for completing the questionnaires was made available through community leaders, post offices, neighborhood stores, and other convenient places. Enumerators in these areas also carried a specially printed form (Form D–350) containing the Spanish version of all the questions, both 100% and sample. This form was given to a Spanish-speaking respondent to follow as questions were asked during the census interview.

Attached are the forms mentioned above.

[Note: The forms were not included.]

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The Census Bureau had to go on something to determine which were the central areas in which Spanish-origin population was in a high proportion. The 1960 census was used as a base, but the figures were updated to 1969 according to the information from the local areas, and I believe that that was at least one of the methods by which the district offices were selected for the receiving of these questionnaires.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think that would be important to get for the record, because we were being told this morning by the Census Director, as I understoood it, it would be very difficult to do an undercount statement because of lack of hard data. So it's interesting they were able to determine this data in another area.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes. The reason for the difficulty for the undercount, if I might just expand a bit on what Director Barabba very capably said, was that the present demographic methodology available, the traditional demographic methodology available, which is used today—and no other method has been devised to supplant it—requires national estimates of births, deaths, or life tables and net immigration.

Now, we don't have these statistics for the Spanish population. Besides that, these particular records would be required for many years in the past.

Another thing that would be required to be able to use this particular demographiic technique for measuring undercount would be comparable censuses that would give us data similar to the one in 1970 that we got for the Spanish-origin population.

In 1970 it was like a breakthrough in getting data on the Spanish population. We expanded our categories on Spanish, and when compared to other censuses we went out of the way to get as much information on the Spanish population as we could.

So, therefore, we don't have those comparable censuses from the past as one of the ingredients for being able to use the demographic techniques to measure this particular undercount.

This is the main reason why we don't have a measure of the undercount.

The fact that we are willing to go through a measure of undercount is shown with the black population. We have mentioned another count of that. We have publicly made our own studies to produce figures on the undercount for the black population. The reason we have it for the black and the total population is that with these demographic techniques we can only measure undercount at a national level because of the ingredient of net immigration. The measure of net immigration for local areas is a very, very difficult task.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. What about what Congressman Roybal brought up—the census that you took after the census, in 1973, I believe it was?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No, I am afraid there is a misunderstanding on this issue. There are two main sources of statistical data that the Bureau of the Census uses, two main sources—the decennial census and the current population survey. These are two distinct statistical collection methods.

The current population survey of March 1973 was the one that Congressman Roybal mentioned. There are marked differences between the census and the current population survey.

The population of Spanish origin that we got in March 1973 was about 10.5 million, which was an increase of 1½ million over the 1970 census. This is comparable if we analyze the statistics to what was gotten for the total count that was gotten for the Spanish-origin population in 1970.

The 1970 census was mainly a mail-in, mail-out type of census which also had the conventional procedures of interviewing. The current

population survey is exclusively an interview type of statistical collection procedure with a lot of the interviews done by telephone. There you have a basic difference.

Now, the current population survey, the total sample is 50,000 households throughout the country. The Spanish population as it has been counted is about 5 percent of the total population. Some of the estimates gotten on the Spanish-origin population from the current population survey are gotten with a large sampling error.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. May I ask a question? If the 1970 census, as you stated, went out of its way to get statistics on Spanish-origin people, why did you only put that on 15 percent of the surveys and the other 5 percent of the survey? Why didn't you put it on 100 percent?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I'm afraid I can't answer that directly. I don't know.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Could you get us the rationale for that?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes, because it really seems like it is an intentional miscount when you see that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I don't see how it could be a miscount. There were other questions that were included in the 5-percent questionnaire. The question on citizenship, for example, and other questions were asked on a 5-percent basis.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Could you get us the rationale?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I will try, if it exists—why it was put on the 5 percent and not on the 100 percent. Maybe it's an issue of not confounding it with the racial issue which was a 100-percent item, but I really don't know. I will try to investigate and find out.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I do think that is very important because we are getting more and more testimony as to the wide distribution of Spanish-origin people in the country.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Well, the 5-percent sample was a nationwide sample. It covered everyone.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is that enough of a sampling to give an overall count.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, it is.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. As a normal practice?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes; as I said, there were other important characteristics of the population that were sampled on a 5-percent basis.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Such as?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Citizenship was one. I don't recall others, but there were others on a 5-percent basis.

The fact is that the estimates that you get from a 5-percent sample are open to a wider distribution. I think that one basic misconception that is being held——

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Can they be considered as factual when you apply it nationwide?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Of course—subjected to a particular sampling error. The total population that we got for the total Spanish origin in 1970 was 9,072,000. One standard error would be a plus or minus 17,000 persons, which means there is a 68-percent chance that the 9,072,000 persons that we estimated from that 5-percent sample would be the true numbers had we increased the question on a 100-percent basis. That is the concept of sampling reliability.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is what we are really talking about here.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The misconception that exists is because you sampled on a 5-percent basis you only counted 5 percent of the population, and that is a mistake. It's a 5-percent sample, which means that the sampling reliability is greater than if you had taken a larger sample.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Thank you. That's the old argument that when Gallup says they take 1,500 people across the country that at that time is the sampling of opinion, you know, and that's really the old argument, isn't it?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Could I ask this gentleman, Mr. Fernandez, if you'd be willing to make sure Mr. Barabba and you submit to us the cost factors. Did you hear my question previously?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Would you be able to do that?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes.

[The following letter was furnished:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1974.

Hon. PATRICIA SCHROEDER,
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Census and Population, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN SCHROEDER: This is in reply to Congressman Rousselot's request for estimates of the cost of implementing those requirements of H.J. Res. 92 which are concerned with providing economic and social statistics for Americans of Spanish origin and descent (specifically, sections 1-3).

As regards section 1, determining the feasibility and cost of developing and publishing monthly unemployment data, I would first note that such data are now produced monthly by the Bureau of the Census and made available to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. These data, of course, because of the relatively smaller number of Spanish-origin persons in the population, are somewhat less reliable than are the data for other population groups. However, these monthly unemployment estimates can still be utilized in many areas of planning, research, and evaluation, if one is aware of the sampling variability attached to the estimates.

Were the Bureau to be requested to provide monthly unemployment data on persons of Spanish origin with greater reliability, an expansion of the Current Population Survey would be required with concomitant cost increases. The exact cost, of course, would reflect the degree of improvement desired. Because of the possible substantial cost implications in any expansion of the CPS, we would suggest instead that the problem be approached in a series of stages. The first would consist of a methodological and developmental project to explore the most efficient means of achieving the stated objective at a minimum cost. Approximately one year and $150,000 would be required for this purpose. At the same time, we would propose to discuss with the Department of Labor and other users of these statistics alternative levels of reliability which could be achieved at much less cost, yet meet the policy needs for these data. Subsequently, we would prepare a statement detailing the alternatives and presenting the cost implications. One possibility, for example, would consist of expanding the sample to provide the same reliability for the estimate of unemployment of the Spanish-origin group as now exists for the black population. This range of possibilities would permit the Congress to weigh the cost implications against the expected gains in reliability.

To illustrate one extreme, the preparation of monthly unemployment data for the Spanish-origin group with a level of reliability approximately equivalent to that for the total population would require an increase of some 15 fold in the number of Spanish-origin households interviewed each month. We estimate that the cost of such an expansion might cost between $45 and $50 million each year. Achieving this level of reliability on a quarterly basis might cost between $25

and $80 million per year. Finally, even to provide this level of improved reliability for an annual estimate might require a cost increase of some $10 million per year.

I am unable to provide estimates of the cost of implementing sections 2 and 3 of the resolution since they require the extensive participation and involvement of one or more other Federal agencies, even beyond those specified in the resolution. Our best judgment at this time is that the Census Bureau might require between $300,000 and $500,000 to participate fully in the studies specified in the resolution.

Although all costs cited above are rough approximations, we trust that they will be helpful to the Committee in its deliberations.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BARABBA,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Is Mr. Fierro here? Welcome to the committee. I'm sorry you had to wait.

STATEMENT OF MANUEL FIERRO, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISPANIC AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. FIERRO. Madam Chairwoman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Manuel D. Fierro. I am the president of the National Congress of Hispanic American Citizens—El Congreso—a national, nonpartisan citizens' lobby for the Spanish-speaking.

On behalf of our 25-member national board of trustees, and the 95 participating national and local Spanish-speaking organizations that represent over 3 million Spanish-speaking people, I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you and express our full support for House Joint Resolution 92, sponsored by Congressman Edward Roybal and Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder.

This resolution directs the Bureau of the Census, Department of Labor, Office of Management and Budget, and other Federal data-gathering agencies to begin collecting data that will accurately depict the social and economic conditions of the Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and other Spanish-speaking groups in this country.

I also want to commend Congressman Edward Roybal, Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder, and this subcommittee for their unyielding efforts in seeking to correct some of the inequities that have been perpetrated against the Spanish-speaking community of this country.

For too many years now, the Spanish speaking have been denied access to many of this country's institutions and have been callously barred from the mainstream of American life. Our community has not been offered the opportunity to share the benefits this country has to offer on the same basis as other citizens, and we have often been prevented from fully and equally participating in the political, economic, social, and cultural life of the United States.

This state of affairs has been exacerbated by the absence of accurate and current data on the status of the Spanish speaking and, as a consequence, our unique and particular needs have generally been ignored; and we often fail to receive the proportional share of assistance to which we are justly entitled because of serious informational gaps and the lack of meaningful statistics and data.

Beyond any question, if the Spanish speaking are to advance and receive proper recognition, it is essential that we have accurate information. It is a tragic commentary that agencies like the Bureau of

the Census, Department of Labor, Office of Management and Budget, and the other Federal agencies can neither furnish realistic nor accurate data today on the Spanish speaking.

What is even worse is the blatant indifference of these agencies in taking affirmative steps to correct these gross inequities and move to compile and disseminate accurate social and economic statistics on the Spanish-speaking community.

If a real commitment to aid this country's Spanish-speaking community is to be made and pursued, we must know where we stand, and we must have the basic facts on which to build viable, workable programs.

The Federal Government must have pertinent and faultless information in order to effectively identify the urgent and special needs of our community. Certain fundamental data is needed if we are to come to grips with the problems of poverty, deprivation, poor education and housing, unemployment and underemployment, disease and malnutrition which are plaguing our community today.

Again I commend this committee for holding this timely and most important hearing, and I urge you to move decisively and without any further delays in favorably reporting out this vital legislation.

I have shortened the statement that was going to be submitted to the committee for a number of reasons. One, the Mexican American Population Commission will be submitting a statement for the record to this committee. Representatives from California were to be here, but because of scheduling problems were unable to attend. But, nevertheless, I think that the information provided this committee has been well documented this past session, and that's the reason that I did not go on to elaborate the reasons for the need for this type of legislation.

I sincerely hope that this committee will assert itself, get this legislation on the floor, and, additionally, I would like to indicate to the committee that the members of the Senate are also considering introducing this resolution on the Senate side. This will be done, hopefully, next week or right after the Easter recess.

That is the end of my statement. If you have any questions, I will be delighted to answer them.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much. I think it was a very good, terse statement, and it sums up very much what, I think, is needed.

I also appreciate your being terse, because, I think, you're right. This has been documented in the past session, and now I think we want some action. I think the rhetoric we are all tired of. And let's move on to the next phase.

Mr. FIERRO. Let me just say all the major national Spanish-speaking organizations, many of you are familiar with—SER, Napa, Calif., the American GI Forum, LULAC, Image, the Latin American Manufacturing Association, et cetera. This statement is in their behalf. I made it brief, but they are supportive of this legislation, and they will see to it that they will consult with other Congressmen and Senators to make sure that this legislation is passed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. We do appreciate your conciseness and going right to the point, and you are to be commended for that.

Could you comment on my question to Congressman Roybal? Do most of these 95 participating national and local Spanish-speaking organizations accept the terminology "Americans of Spanish origin or descent?"

Mr. FIERRO. I think in terms as a better identifier, yes. I think if the Spanish origin is used, or Spanish descent, along with other names—for example, one of the samples they did was put in about five categories underneath that. I think there we'd have no problem because there are some differences, but again it's a better identifier for our community.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. It's a better identifier?

Mr. FIERRO. Yes. All these organizations have no problem in accepting this identifier. They recognize the importance of those statistics and the impact that they will have on our communities and on the organizations.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Good. Just for the record can you tell us how many members there are roughly in the 95?

Mr. FIERRO. Approximately 3 million.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I have no other questions at this time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much.

Mr. FIERRO. Again let me commend also the chairwoman of this committee for the position she now holds.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you.

Is Roberto Olivas here?

Welcome. You have been very patient.

You are the national director of the National Council de la Raza?

STATEMENT OF ROBERTO OLIVAS, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SERVICES OFFICE, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA, ACCOMPANIED BY KLAUS W. MAY, RESEARCH ANALYST

Mr. OLIVAS. I am director, National Services for the National Council of La Raza.

Distinguished members of the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Census and Population, I am Roberto Olivas, Director of National Services for the National Council of La Raza. My office has the responsibility of analyzing national policies with regard to the statistical and economic impact such policies might have on the Hispanic American population.

I appreciate you having extended us this invitation to appear before you and share some of our observations and recommendations.

In the interest of time, I shall only highlight those points which we believe must be brought directly to your attention, but I would request that the prepared material which I am submitting to your subcommittee be included into the record of these hearings.

If I may depart, Madam Chairwoman, for a moment, we are talking about something that we are not quite certain about. It sounds right, but somehow there is so much interest, so much activity, that it has to be clarified.

Let me share with you an analogy that I think will reinforce the balance of my comments.

Prior to coming to Washington—I am from California, Congressman, from Carpinteria——

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Welcome.

Mr. OLIVAS [continuing]. I was a coachbuilder. As I first opened my shop—and I was open for business for anything that had to do with good coachbuilding—I heard thunder, and the clouds opened up, and I heard a deep voice say, "Roberto."

I said, "Yes!"

He said, "This is the Lord."

I said, "Yes, Lord!"

He said, "I want you to build an ark."

I said, "Yes, Lord."

He said, "The ark must be 40 cubits by 80 cubits."

I said, "Yes, Lord."

There was a silence, and he said, "Any questions!"

I said, "No, Lord. I've got it; 40 cubits by 80 cubits."

So, to make a long story short, I proceeded to buy a lot of material, hire staff, and do a lot of studies so as to understand how to build an ark—until it came to "what is a cubit."

Needless to say, the ark was never built, although there was a lot of energy and activity expended in the effort.

Somehow I feel that this particular activity here needs to define the "cubits." And when I said earlier that my office has responsibility for analyzing national policies: I look for the "cubits" in them.

In order to properly respond to your invitation and request that we provide you with testimony "relating to the publication of economic and social statistics for Americans of Spanish origin or descent," we must first establish that the question of identifiers must be resolved. Otherwise, we will only be adding to the confusion with regard to Hispanic Americans and the inability to identify them statistically, economically, politically, and socially.

Again at this point I will depart only to explain that analogy. There are many viewpoints you have heard today. Some seem to provide better identifiers than others. We view Hispanic American as being an umbrella expression, the same as European, Asian, and other nationalities have an umbrella identifier. But under these are the subdivisions or subcategories. In the Asian category, for example, you will find the Japanese, the Chinese, the Korean, the South Pacific, the Filipino, and so forth.

In the Hispanic American you will also find the Mexican American, the Chicano, the Puerto Rican, the Cuban, all the various terms that the Congressman spoke of earlier.

So, therefore, we wish to briefly provide a basis for why we feel that it is necessary to look at this "cubit" of Hispanic American with regard to the kind of interpretation that must be considered. This, in turn, not only reflects who the population is and where they are, but also can provide an interpretation for economic and political purposes.

Mr. MAY. If I may also introduce myself, I am Klaus May and I work with Mr. Olivas as a research analyst, and I would like to very briefly address a comment which you have raised, Congressman Rous-

selot, pertaining to the question of whether the Spanish-origin terminology is satisfactory.

We have no qualms or difficulties with the terminology. The difficulty stems from the fact that we have four or five different terminologies, Spanish language, Spanish origin, Spanish surname, Spanish heritage, and Spanish ancestry. All of these terminologies have different statistical implications.

The Spanish-origin count, for example, on most county levels and on a national level is the lowest possible count of the Hispanic American population.

For example, in the State of Colorado, most of the counties have a higher Spanish-language person count than the Spanish-origin count. There are 15 counties in your State, Congresswoman Schroeder, that have a higher Spanish-origin count.

So I am raising this question, not that we have any difficulties in terms of terminology or wording, but in terms of the statistical implications, and I just wanted to correct this.

Mr. OLIVAS. Thank you, Klaus, and I apologize for not introducing our research analyst.

I shall continue.

To better establish that the time has come for the acceptance of the term "Hispanic American" as the appropriate language which can best serve as the umbrella identifier rather than "Spanish origin" or "Spanish surname," I believe that the question of identifiers is a constitutional issue which, unless it is clarified by appropriate legislation, will continue to be argued in the courts of this country until such time as the ethnicity of our people becomes the identifier instead of race, color, or language.

It is tragic that in the process inalienable rights of our people will continue to be violated and abridged in spite of the fact that the 14th and 15th amendments of the Constitution state, "* * * nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law * * *"—and it continues into the 15th—"on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude."

We view with dismay section 5 of the 14th amendment which states, "The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

And we wonder why Congress has failed to recognize that providing for language which recognizes ethnicity would serve all those people who have not been served by the race or color identifiers. Had this been the case, perhaps the misery and confusion which produced the *Sanchez* v. *State* case noted in the following paragraphs would have been avoided.

It was not until the time when the U.S. Supreme Court decided on *Brown* v. *Board of Education* that the Court clearly defined that 14th amendment guarantees are not directed solely to the differences between white and Negro. It was in the *Hernandez* v. *Texas* decision that the Supreme Court concluded:

> The State of Texas would have us hold that there are only two classes—white and Negro—within the contemplation of the Fourteenth Amendment. The decisions of this Court do not support that view.

In this 1954 decision, the Court provided for the following commentary:

> Throughout our history differences in race and color have defined easily identifiable groups which have at times required the aid of the courts in securing equal treatment under the laws. But community prejudices are not static, and from time to time other differences from the community norm may define other groups which need the same protection. Whether such a group exists within a community is a question of fact. When the existence of a distinct class is demonstrated, and it is further shown that the laws, as written or as applied, single out that class of different treatment not based on some reasonable classification, the guarantees of the Constitution have been violated. The Fourteenth Amendment is not directed solely against discrimination due to a "two-class theory"—that is, based upon differences between "white" and Negro.

According to the Court, "the evidence in this case was sufficient to prove that, in the county in question, persons of Mexican descent constitute a separate class, distinct from 'whites.' "

For many years prior to *Hernandez* v. *Texas*, many courts had considered Mexican Americans as members of the white race and therefore not entitled to relief under the equal protection clause.

In a much earlier decision, the Court had already established that the "color" designation under the Constitution involves a multiplicity of distinct groups and not merely the black or Negro race. In view of the Hispanic Americans' identification with the distinct color class, that would clearly bring the Hispanic American within the coverage under the 14th amendment.

In this case, *Gom Lum* v. *Rice*, decided upon in 1927, involving a Chinese, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the Mississippi Supreme Court interpretation of the distinction between "white" and "colored" as dividing the population "into those of the pure white or Caucasian race, on the one hand, and the brown, yellow, and black races on the other hand."

The issue of attaining relief under the equal protection clause was not a simple one, as illustrated by the 1944 case of *Sanchez* v. *State*, in which a Mexican American teenager was convicted of murder and sentenced to death, even though the boy was blind and mentally retarded, and was retaliating to an attack on his father. Under the applicable criminal statutes, the boy was physically not able to have the intent to justify a finding of first-degree murder.

In his appeal, the attorneys for the defendant sought to apply 14th amendment guarantees under which Mexican Americans would have been afforded their right to serve on a jury. Although the county's population was more than 50 percent Mexican American, no member from this community had ever served on a jury. In this case, however, the court held that the 14th amendment did not extend to Mexican Americans. The teenager was executed that year.

The issue here is not one of illustrating the contradictions and ambiguities of such court decisions and rulings. Rather, it is one of illustrating how Hispanic Americans have sought to deal with, or are affected by, such decisions, in the struggle for equal protection under the law.

In the absence of clear language within the 14th amendment, various approaches were taken and advocated by both public agencies and by Hispanic Americans to attain such protection. In that process, the

"two class" system, the race and color designations have been found as not only inaccurate identifiers but also as unconstitutional.

It is appropriate to note here that, whereas the major litigation and legal activity pertaining to identifiers involves Mexican Americans, they have set the legal basis for Hispanic Americans in general.

Now, I have additional material that I will submit for the record, Madam Chairperson.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much.

Mr. OLIVAS. But, some brief comments with regard specifically to the bill which you requested that we review.

Analysis of H.J. Res. 92

How does the previous commentary relate to the specific issue at hand? A brief review of House Joint Resolution 92 reveals that the resolution moves toward addressing the question of providing for more data on "Spanish origin" persons through mandates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Census Bureau, the Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Management and Budget. Although it redefines Spanish-origin persons to encompass the Western Hemisphere Hispanic Americans, that may not at all be how the Federal agencies interpret what constitutes Spanish-origin persons.

As noted in the comments on the State of Idaho, for instance, the Spanish-language persons count is significantly higher than the Spanish-origin count of the 1970 census, and the statewide count is significantly higher when the highest county data are combined.

An accurate reflection of what the subcommittee wants would involve a clarification of the terminology from "Spanish origin" to "Hispanic American," in order that the Federal agencies would be given a clear mandate on what data would be collected as well as how it would be defined or identified.

Section 1 of the resolution recommends that a study be undertaken to determine the feasibility of monthly national unemployment data. It is appropriate here to note that the statistical systems are moving toward regional, State, and small areas data, and that an effective feasibility study would include detailed consideration of this question. Further, such a study requires an appropriate and specific timetable for completion, for in the Federal management-oriented world any task must have a deadline.

It is also appropriate to note here that extensive and important statistical data on the unemployed in all States is accessible through the Manpower Administration's ESARS system—Employment Services Automated Retrieval System—and that the availability of such data on Hispanic Americans on a monthly basis would allow for a more detailed assessment of State manpower needs. Such data would be a vital complement to BLS data.

In section 2, the Department of Agriculture is encouraged to press for extensive data activities. Here again, specific concern may be raised relative to regional and statewide data activities, and, accordingly, the necessity of expanding the sample currently used to provide for more accurate data.

Section 3 creates a mandate for Office of Management and Budget to initiate a Government-wide program for data collection but fails

to provide for the specificity which government agencies, such as Office of Management and Budget, must insist upon. The clear designation of some of the statistical services systems that the subcommittee seeks to have specifically included—beyond Bureau of Labor Statistics, Census, and Agriculture—would enhance the development of a Government-wide program.

The question here is whether Congress also desires to insure that such other agencies concerned with the issue, such as the National Center for Health Statistics, National Center for Educational Statistics, National Center for Social Statistics, Manpower Administration, Social Security Administration, Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, and Department of the Treasury, are included in the process of developing a uniform, National, regional, State and small areas statistical system specifically including Hispanic Americans as an identifiable statistical set.

Noted is the absence of any deadline for such mandate to Office of Management and Budget, as well as the absence of congressional and other citizens' input on any prepared plans and recommendations.

Section 4 calls upon the Census Bureau to prepare a study on the undercount issue to assist in the development of an improved 1980 census court. Here again the Census would prefer specific guidance on the intent of Congress on when such study should be completed, as well as whether Congress merely desires a simple analysis of the Spanish-origin undercount issue, or a detailed analysis also involving the Spanish-surnamed, Spanish-language, Spanish mother tongue, and the various national origin groups' identifiers affected by the undercount issue.

Further, it is not clear if this mandate addresses solely the national undercount rate or if the subcommittee intends specifically to acquire some estimates and analyses by State, and Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area and county undercount data.

Section 5 of the resolution provides for bilingual questionnaires and enumerators in census activities. Does the subcommittee suggest that this activity applies to all Census Bureau activities—including the 100-percent count and other sample counts of the 1980 census, or only current population survey activities?

Although it appears implicit in the resolution that the 1980 census should include a Hispanic American identifier in the 100 percent 1980 census count, the absence of any explicit guideline upon which the Census Bureau could act unequivocally, and which would suggest that the 1980 census also allow for data, insure that there is 1980 data comparable with 1970 census data, in order to facilitate appropriate studies on the undercount and related issues subsequent to 1980 census activities.

This is the portion, Madam Chairperson, I will present, and you already have the balance of the material, which only expands upon those points that I have elaborated on.

[The remaining portion of the statement follows:]

COMMENTS ON SOME CURRENT ISSUES

The balance of this testimony contains several items of useful background information which address the issues of statistical policies as they pertain to Hispanic Americans. Nearly a year ago, during June 1974, a similar invitation was extended to us, and at that time we spoke at length on the same matter.

At that time, the National Council of La Raza submitted its report on the *Impact of Limited Federal Statistical Data/Information Policies on Hispanic Americans* which is included within those hearing's report.

It is with a long standing sense of frustration that we respond to the committee's invitation. Since June of last year, the National Council has engaged in numerous efforts to persuade federal policy-makers and selected public interest groups in the statistics area to understand how they can better serve the real needs of Hispanic Americans with regard to a proper designation which will produce a more accurate count of todays Hispanic Americans in this country. While it is possible to say that some of the principal statistical services agencies, such as the Statistical Policies Division of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Social and Economic Statistics Administration of the Department of Commerce, are more aware of the basic concerns voiced by many Hispanic Americans, this "awareness" is far from the concrete and systematic actions and decisions that are necessary from a statistical services perspective, and they have been extremely slow to either recognize or develop statistical data which is vital to decision making with regard to serving the needs of Hispanic Americans.

It is only during this month, March 1974, for example, that OMB officially authorized the Census Bureau to establish an Advisory Committee on "Spanish Origin Persons", although that matter had been under discussion for some time. Similarly, even though a considerable amount of discussion has taken place relative toward establishing uniform standards and policies on the use of definitions and identifiers of Hispanic Americans in educational statistics services, under the auspices of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education, we are not aware of any significant results. Finally, although the amount of funds proposed for FY 1976 in the *Budget of the United States Government* is listed at $529.4 million for all principal federal statistical services, which is $130.5 million higher than the actual budget for FY 1974, and $46.9 million higher than the FY 1975 estimate, we fail to note either expanded or new commitments toward improving data on Hispanic American groups. If this is the case, then, the only conclusions we can draw will be that, in spite of a greater cost factor, private and public interest groups, from business sectors to state and local units of government, as well as the many federal program agencies, will have no more useful data by which to plan and assess their policies and programs, than they currently are forced to use. One of many examples which we can cite being, "uniformity of data shall be used as provided by the Bureau of the Census or the Department of Commerce". As mandated by the Revenue Sharing Act.

During last year's hearings of this subcommittee, the Census Bureau, Statistical Reporting Service of USDA, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicated their support for, and emphatically noted the desirability—even necessity—for increased and improved data development activities on Hispanic Americans—from their agencies' perspectives. This concern seems not to be reflected in the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year. For example, the Federal policy-makers have stated that they recognized the need for more frequent production of current data on Hispanic Americans, particularly in manpower related areas. As a consequence of the continuing economic crisis of this nation conversely, there seems to be less than an enthusiastic response to the objective concerns of the various Hispanic American groups by many federal agencies, including the previously named, and others, such as the National Centers For Health Statistics, Educational Statistics and, Social Statistics of The Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Since such agencies' data is the basis not only for program development and evaluation, but, more significant, budget policy, these agencies' population statistical policies must be critically evaluated by both our constituency and yours.

Prior to assessing some of the critical problem areas and categories in the federal statistical enterprise, it is appropriate that we maintain a perspective of some of the more "human" elements of this question. It would be tragic, as well as inaccurate to allow the population statistical policy issues to be decided on the basis of budgetary and/or political considerations or, to be the sole property and prerogative of the traditionally recognized academic and research community who to date, have escalated research costs yet failed to agree, much less resolve the problems which confront us, specifically with regard to identifiers. One may view the issue, instead, as a question of human rights in an increasingly system oriented society.

For example, the Report by the Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project, Inc., *Children Out of School In America*, released in December

1974, vividly portrays the enormity of the so-called "drop-out problem" of our country. It bases part of its conclusions on 1970 Census data which reveals that "nearly two million children 7 to 17 years of age were not enrolled in school. Over one million were between 7 and 15 years of age. More than three-quarters of a million were between ages 7 and 13". But, the study adds, "Census data, however, do not reveal the real dimensions of the out of school problem in America. What we learned from talking to thousands of parents and children in our survey of over 8,500 households in 30 areas and from hundreds of additional interviews with school officials and community leaders convinces us that the nearly two million children the Census counts as nonenrolled only reflects the surface of how many children are out of school in America". Among those not included, according to this study, are "the many children whose parents do not understand English and who therefore, did not correctly answer the Census nonenrollment questionnaire". An additional "source of error is that the 1970 Census undercounted the population by an estimated 5.3 million people (2.5 percent)", was noted in this study.

In its surveys of census tract areas with heavier concentrations of Mexican American, for example, the study found in Denver's Census Tract 8 that 69% of the people to be Mexican American, as contrasted with the 1970 Census estimate of 33% persons of Spanish language.

Let us look at a somewhat different example. Currently there is a massive effort underway, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to search and deport illegal aliens. The particular focus of this activity has been on Mexican Nationals, and Hispanic Americans from Western Hemisphere countries in general. Various *estimates* have been made of the numbers involved—ranging into the three and four million number by Administration. Significantly, no such estimates or focus exist vis a vis Canadians and other non-Hispanics from the Western Hemisphere, or people from other continents. More importantly, however, is the publicly admitted fact that neither INS, nor other federal agencies have any statistical data upon which to make *any* estimates of the number of illegals. Here we can see how readily some in our government are prepared to guess, cite, and even inflate figures, if it is related to this nation's policing activities and when it becomes publicly expedient. As one consequence, many of the legal residents of Hispanic American origin, have become suspect in the eyes of many of the other citizens, and, of course, law enforcement officers. It is common knowledge that citizens and other legal residents or visitors of Hispanic American extraction are also being harassed, searched, detained, and even arrested. The point is that the reaction has been and is less of a rational one, based on sound information and statistics, than one of facile guesses and unchanged prejudices of past generations.

Related to this issue is the "statistical debate" surrounding agricultural migrant labor. A review of INS data, for instance, shows that from 1968 to 1972 a total of 741 aliens identified as agricultural laborers were deported, and a total of 1749 aliens identified as agricultural laborers were required to depart during this five year period. Yet a major issue has been, for years, the alleged large number of alien Hispanic American agricultural migrant labor. INS provides no statistics on this matter. Nor is there any extensive current data on the Hispanic American agricultural work-force, both non-alien and alien, provided from other sources. The presumption has often been that the largest element in the Hispanic American population is in the rural areas and in the agricultural work-force, and that a significant proportion of that element is illegal. This presumption has no basis in any statistical systems—INS, Census, or other Agriculture Department data. Nearly 80% of the Mexican-American population live in the nation's urban areas, and the total for the Hispanic American population is much higher. Further, all available data indicates that the agricultural work-force in the Hispanic American population is primarily composed of citizens and legal residents. As a result of these various presumptions, however, both the public and private sectors have tended to look at the Hispanic American issue as primarily seasonal, temporary, localized and rural in nature, little statistical import and of even less import in terms of fiscal commitments in the area of social service and economic development programs.

The extent to which social and economic statistics on Hispanic Americans are "botched" is indicated in a brief study the Council undertook on the State of Idaho, a copy of which is appended. Particular emphasis should be noted with regard to *how* the "botching" takes place on the issue. In identifying Hispanic Americans, Census and other agencies have selected the traditional identifiers

which are "Spanish Language" or "Spanish Origin" neither of which represent or can be a true indicator of this population. Based solely on 1970 Census data, the report shows that there are 13 counties with no "Spanish origin" populations, but eight of which have a "Spanish language" population, and of seven counties identified as having no Spanish language population, two have Spanish origin populations. There exists a significant difference for 29 of the 44 counties in Idaho between the persons of Spanish Origin Counts and persons of Spanish Language Counts. In six counties where there are no Spanish Origin persons, the State of Idaho, using 4th Count 1970 Census data identifies Spanish Surnamed unemployed persons, with unemployment rates range from below 1% and 67%. Finally, if one were to add the Idaho counties' largest Hispanic population estimates—Spanish Language or Spanish Origin, whichever is higher—then there is a 27.4% difference in the size of the Hispanic American population *above* the Spanish Origin count, and an approximately 11% difference above the Spanish Language persons count.

The issue here is that much of our current data is based on "Spanish Origin" estimates provided through the Current Population Survey which, by itself, as can be readily demonstrated, cannot provide for accurate social and economic indicators of the conditions confronting Hispanic Americans on local and state levels. It is at these levels where basic economic development, manpower and human services systems are being operated.

If the data at these levels, provided by the 5% and 15% national samples of the Bureau of the Census, are clearly inadequate, then it is also apparent that the Current Population Surveys, involving a much smaller sampling of some 50,000 persons, will have severe limitations, in no manner reflecting the real needs of Hispanic American communities throughout the nation. Policies—national policies—based solely on such data have an inherently discriminatory impact on these communities. Above all, however, they result in both neglect and discriminatory practices against individuals and families who happen to be Hispanic American, as well as do a disservice to the total American society.

THE NATIONAL POLICY ISSUE

Idaho's statistics previously cited, reflect the realities of a number of similar states where there are concentrations of Hispanic Americans. All too often, it is forgotten that a considerable proportion of the Hispanic American population reside, outside of the areas upon which policy-makers usually focus. In a draft report on *The Hispanic American Population: A National Planning Policy Issue for the 1980 Census* prepared by the Council, we sought to focus on this issue, noting that over 900,000 Hispanic Americans live in the Deep South and border states (Mason-Dixon Line), of which less than one half are in the state of Florida. Another two million live in the Great Lakes, North Central, and, Northwestern States. Thus, perhaps thirty percent of the total U.S. Hispanic population can be identified within these named regions alone. The question raised here, of course, pertains to the objectivity of some policy-makers who continue to believe that the Hispanic American population is "not national in scope", but is regional in nature. The current Director of the Census Bureau, for instance, has indicated that the Hispanic American is not necessarily a national statistical policy issue, a view conflicting with the Bureau's own statistical information. Its own regional breakdown of Spanish Origin data, for example, shows the following:

Northeast	1,895,218
North Central	1,048,507
South	2,761,987
West	3,367,525

Other regional breakdowns, according to the Standard Federal Regions, indicate a similar population spread. In spite of these statistical realities, however, the dominant policy perspective of the Hispanic American population is that it is a regional issue encompassing the five Southwestern States, New York City, and Miami. This orientation does much to contribute to the exclusion of Hispanic American interests and needs from national policy considerations.

Without accurate and comparable data on Hispanic Americans the development of policies that also reflect the needs and interests of Hispanic Americans, becomes difficult, if not impossible. This reality is fully reflected in the major policy documents of the Federal Government. For example, the *1974 President's Report on National Growth and Development* emphatically notes the importance

of the accurate demographic data: "Intelligent growth policies must reflect population trends. The rate of population growth, the proportions of young, adult and elderly people in the society, and the movement of people within the country are constantly changing. As this occurs new demands are generated for the production of goods and services by the private sector and the satisfaction of public needs by governments."

The President's report is unequivocal about the impact of demographic patterns on policies, both national and regional. While this report, prepared under the direction of the Domestic Council, specifically recognizes the necessity of addressing the differential national and regional needs and interests of the country's Black population, no concern is voiced with respect to Hispanic Americans.

A parallel example is the "Social Indicators" activity of the Office of Management and Budget's Statistical Policies Division. OMB's intent is to prepare a biennial *Social Indicators* report, and its second document is being prepared during this year. In the hearings of this subcommittee of one year ago, we noted the absence of any data in OMB's *Social Indicators 1973*, and our concern over the possible uses of such document as a basis for policy formulation and evaluation. Here, too, as in the Domestic Council document, the only breakdown provided is by Black and White identifiers.

The basic policy orientation by the highest policy units of our Federal government, is, logically, reflected in other governmental units making recommendations or advising on policy matters—as can be seen in the activities of the National Commission on Productivity, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Council of Economic Advisors, and many others.

As a consequence of this condition, national goals have been, and are being set, which do not incorporate the equal opportunity for Hispanic Americans. The nature of our nation's domestic problems is being assessed as if Hispanic Americans do not exist, and needs and interests are being "forecasted", but no such information is being contemplated for Hispanic Americans. Indeed, the *President's Report* goes so far as to state that it "offers a selective overview of population trends which carry the seeds for future growth issues". A purely literal interpretation, based on a review of the document, would suggest that Hispanic Americans are not included among "the seeds of future growth issues" in terms of national policy directives. One way for the public to insure that such "oversights", be appropriately corrected, is to begin to recognize and articulate the fact that, *ethnicity* rather than "color or language" is a more applicable criteria by which "all other people" can be identified and defined.

AN EXCERPT FROM THE OCTOBER 4, 1974, MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POPULATION STATISTICS

Spanish origin.—Mr. Zitter said that if Spanish origin is made a 100-percent item it will be asked of all people, the majority of whom are not affected. Perhaps all people should be allowed to identify themselves through an ethnicity item.

[Proposed question]

Part A	*Part B*
I. *Color or Race*	II. *Spanish Origin or Descent*
Fill one circle	Fill one circle
If "Indian (Amer.)", *also* give tribe.	O Mexican American
If "Other", *also* give race.	O Chicano
O White	O Mexican (Mexicano)
O Negro or Black	O Puerto Rican
O Indian (Amer.) print tribe	O Cuban
O Japanese	O Central or South American country
O Chinese	O Other Spanish
O Filipino	O No, not of Spanish origin
O Hawaiian	
O Korean	
O Aleut	
O Eskimo	
O Other—print race	

One proposal (see question above) would be to tie Spanish identification with the race question; another would be to use the same identification question but separate it from race. Mr. Johnson said that the Spanish-origin item might differ from that used in 1970. Using three Mexican categories—Mexican American, Chicano, and Mexican (Mexicano)—increased the count in the Current Population Survey. Other Spanish identifiers—language, place of birth, and surname—may also be included in the 1980 census. Mrs Gulliver said she was interested in the identification of small groups such as Cape Verdeans; Mr. Zitter said these could be identified through place of birth, parents' birthplaces, and race. Mr. Hernandez said that color or race is not an efficient way of identifying some groups. Mr. Olivas said that the ethnic issue involves the entire U.S. population. The Bureau should resolve first whether it is asking for language, color, or ethnic identification.

AN EXCERPT FROM THE OCTOBER 4, 1974, MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POPULATION STATISTICS

Mr. Zitter said that the Bureau is trying to array all three types of questions in appropriate columns. Mr. Olivas said that Hispanic peoples get lost in the OMB's social indicators and in the Census Bureau's urban atlases. Mr. Alvirez felt that respondents ought to have the opportunity to identify themselves ethnically. Mr. Davis said that part A of the color or race item could include Spanish origin. Mr. Alvirez suggested that many Spanish-Americans would hide their Spanish identity by reporting themselves as white, and that including Spanish origin along with color would cause problems for nonwhite respondents. In response to a question by Mr. Davis, Mr. Estrada said that if the respondent's first choice is to answer color—white, black, etc.—he will do this and skip the rest of the item. It would be better to separate Spanish origin from color or race by several questions. Mrs. Gulliver suggested that an assessment is needed of how these questions have been answered in the past, and that input from interested groups and from the ad hoc Spanish committee would be useful. She wondered whether natives of India were identifying themselves as white. Persons identified as natives of India were counted as white in 1970.

Mr. Hernandez said that it is more important to find the causes of undercounting; for example, to investigate how the mail-out/mail-back census technique works in Puerto Rican areas. How precise is the geography of ghetto areas? How much more effective would be the use of bilingual enumerators and questionnaires? What attention is being given to community involvement in the census? At least one Chicano and one Puerto Rican area ought to be included in the pretests for 1980. Mr. Zitter said that this is planned.

In response to a question by Mr. Westoff, Mr. Glick said that census statistics on race have a long history. Is there value in maintaining their continuity? Mr. Lowry said that the respondent should have the option of identifying himself as belonging to a particular group. Mr. Davis said it would be better to have an open-ended question than to present an arbitrary list from which a choice would have to be made. Mr. May said that the Hispanic-Americans have a large mixed element that is neither black nor white; would it be possible to have La Raza, plus Puerto Rican and Cuban groups, review this matter and report to the advisory committee at a future meeting? Mr. Siegel asked whether such persons might choose "brown" if it were offered as a caption for racial preference along a color line of white-brown-Negro/black. Mr. May replied that the Hispanic-American distinction cannot be made along a color line. Mr. Olivas said that the system used to collect the data is important; door-to-door canvassing by bilingual enumerators will get a better total.

Mr. Hernandez, on behalf of himself and several other members of the advisory committee, suggested that the part B wording be changed to (1) omit the word "Spanish" from the "Spanish Origin or Descent" in the title, and (2) substitute the word "nation" for "country" in the category "Central or South American country" in order to avoid confusion . . .

[The witnesses from the National Council of La Raza submitted the following items in support of their testimony: (1) "Special Analyses G of the 1976 Budget of the United States Government," (2) "The Hispanic American Population: A National Planning Policy

Issue for the 1980 Census," and (3) "The Chicano in the State of Idaho." Item (1) mentioned above was retained in the subcommittee files. Items (2) and (3) follow:]

WASHINGTON SCENE REPORT, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA, RAUL YZAGUIRRE, NATIONAL DIRECTOR

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN POPULATION: A NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY ISSUE FOR THE 1980 CENSUS

(Prepared September 1974 by National Services Office, Roberto Olivas, Director; K. W. May, Research Analyst)

Recognizing several years ago the vital need for current and continuing statistical series on the social and economic conditions of the population of Spanish ancestry, the Census Bureau developed and implemented a major program of providing current statistical data to accurately measure the socioeconomic status of the Spanish origin population. . . . Providing current and reliable data on the Spanish ancestry population in the United States is a vital and continuing concern of the Bureau of the Census. In both our current surveys and decennial censuses the Census Bureau will continue to provide statistical measures on the social and economic condition of the Spanish origin population and we welcome your support and cooperation in this endeavour.

Statement by Vincent Barabba, Director Census Bureau, Before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, House of Representatives, May 23, 1974.

During the planning of the project, serious consideration was given to the possible inclusion of a map showing the Spanish origin population. However, the inclusion of this data item was dropped for budgetary reasons. The budget constraints allowed for the inclusion of only twelve census characteristics, and since the Spanish origin population is not necessarily national in scope, this subject was reluctantly excluded from the final publication program.

Vincent Barabba, Director Census Bureau. Response to a Congressional Inquiry on the Urban Atlas Project, August 1, 1974.

PREFACE

This brief report deals with the concerns voiced by some that the Spanish-speaking issue is not really a national policy issue, that it is regional, rather than national in scope.

Using both the Census, and our own somewhat more arbitrarily developed definition of U.S. geographic regions, the report suggests that the Spanish-speaking population poses a nation-wide policy question, in much the same manner that the Black population is a national and not a regional issue—even though well over fifty percent of the Black population is concentrated in the South. In contrast, the largest single Hispanic American population concentration of any of the four Census regions is in the West, which constitutes less than forty percent of the total Hispanic population. Even when using the arbitrary arrangement encompassing the five Southwestern States, well over forty percent of the Hispanic population resides outside of this region.

The report deals at length with the issue, implicitly raising the question of why policy-makers use different criteria for concluding that one issue—Black Americans—is national in scope, and another issue—Hispanic Americans—is regional in scope. Specific note is taken of a position enunciated by the Director of the Bureau of the Census during 1974 on this very matter. Testifying before Congress, the Director emphasized that the Bureau now recognizes the vital need for more data on the Hispanic population, yet only a few months later he noted that in one of its major projects, data on Hispanic Americans was not included because—in part—the Spanish origin characteristic "is not necessarily national in scope."

The question of whether Hispanic Americans ought to be included in data collection and information production should have little to do with the issue of whether or not a particular segment of the population is regional or national in

scope. Indeed, it has very little to do with that matter, as may be seen in the following pages.

The real issue is a socioeconomic question, and since Census data is used for social and economic ends, it is irrelevant whether Hispanic Americans are or are not national in scope. Because the very issue has been raised on a number of occasions, this report may add to bringing about a better understanding of that matter, and—hopefully—dispose of it in order that the more substantive socioeconomic questions may be dealt with.

In the past, Americans had been led to believe that the "Hispanic American Issue" is regional in nature, involving the New York City Metropolitan Area and Dade County, Florida in the eastern half, and the Southwestern States in the other half of the country. Federal agency policies and programs tended to reflect that belief. Accompanying that regional conceptualization was the ethnic identification of each region into Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Mexican American spheres of influence. Both the ethnic identifiction and the regional conceptualization are misleading.

A brief review of the ethnic issue, based on the February 1973 PC(SI)-30 *Supplementary Report: Persons of Spanish Ancestry*, illustrates the misleading nature of the ethnic identification of the above regions:

(A) Of the total Cuban count—based on the 5% sample of the 1970 Census—less than half, or 250,407, were located in Florida. Of the remaining 294,220 Cubans in the United States, 175,151 lived in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; 47,549 lived in California; and another 28,373 lived in the North Central/Great Lakes States.

(B) Approximately 65% of the Puerto Rican population is in the State of New York (916,825). Of that population over 90% of the Puerto Ricans identified live in the City. Of the remaining 512,839 outside of New York State, the next largest concentrations of Puerto Ricans are in New Jersey, Illinois, and California, respectively 130,500, 87,500, and 50,917 Boricuas in these States. These are followed, in the order of size, by Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Florida, and Massachusetts and Ohio.

(C) More than 15% of the Mexican American population lives outside the five Southwestern States, and of that 524,849 the largest concentration of Chicanos is in the State of Illinois with 160,477. Illinois is, after California, Texas, and Arizona the largest Chicano community—larger than the Chicano communities of New Mexico (119,049), and Colorado (103,584).

Altogether, nearly 15% of the total Hispanic population, or 1,331,908 Cubanos, Boricuas, and Chicanos live outside of the regions with which they are "ethnically" identified. Due note must be given of the fact that in many areas (States) all three ethnic groups mentioned above are outnumbered by Hispanic Americans from the Caribbean, Central and South America, and others of mixed Hispanic backgrounds. That is the case with 34 States, including—according to the Census sample mentioned previously—New Mexico, Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and Massachusetts. Each of these States has a Hispanic population of more than 70,000.

What conclusions might one draw from the above statistics? The major conclusion, of course, is that the ethnic identification *within* geographic regions can be very misleading. Equally misleading can be the ethnic identification *with* the noted three geographic areas! Over 15% of the Hispanic population in the five Southwestern States is not Chicano. Approximately 40% of the Hispanic population in Florida is not Cubans. And nearly 33% of the Hispanic Americans in New York State are not Boricua. A simple ethnic identification of each region would be as misleading, as the identification of the Hispanic American issue with the Chicano or Mexican-American issue—for nearly 43% of the total Hispanic population in the country is not Chicano or Mexican-American.

Roughly, 56% of the nation's Hispanic population is concentrated in the five Southwestern States of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and California. Slightly over 10% of the total Hispanic population—929,932—is concentrated in the Deep South and the Mason-Dixon line Border States. More than half of the Hispanic population in the South is not in Florida—contrary to the popular notions. Although 405,037 are in Florida, 524,895 are in the other Southern States. About 30% of the Hispanic population is concentrated within the Northeast and Great Lakes States. Only 4% is in the Northwest/North Central (West)

region. The smallest regional Hispanic community is thus in the Mountain, Northern Pacific, and the West North Central area, which constitutes the major proportion of the nation's farm areas.

That the Hispanic American "issue" is not a regional geopolitical issue becomes more apparent when viewed in the context of the regional breakdowns of the Bureau of the Census. The above-cited report on *Persons of Spanish Ancestry*, has the following breakdown: Northeast, 1,895,218; North Central, 1,048,507; South, 2,761,987; and West, 3,367,525.

The combination of Northeast and North Central is larger than the population in the South. A combination of the South and the Northeast or North Central regions would be larger than the Western region. And a combination of the South and the Northeast would be considerably larger than the combination of the Western and North Central ("the Midwest") regions. Finally, the combination of the first three is approximately 70% larger than the Hispanic population in the West, and the latter Hispanic population in the West is only about 14% larger than the Hispanic population in the Northeast and North Central regions.

The contention that the Hispanic issue is a regional question—offered, for example, by the Director of the Bureau of the Census—flies in the face of the Census Bureau's own statistical regions. Of course, the four-part breakdown does not clearly illustrate the extent to which the Hispanic population is dispersed throughout the country. A brief review of the population statistics by State reveals the following:

(A) There are five States with a Hispanic American population of 250,000 to 499,999—Southwest: Arizona and New Mexico; East: Illinois, Florida, New Jersey.

(B) There are five States with a Hispanic American population of 100,000 to 249,999—Southwest: Colorado; East: Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana.

(c) There are eight States with a Hispanic American population of 50,000 to 99,999—West: Washington, Kansas, Oklahoma; South: Louisiana and Missouri; East and Central: Wisconsin, Connecticut, and Massachusetts.

Of the fifteen Old South and Border States (Mason-Dixon Line), only five States have a Hispanic American population of less than 35,000—Delaware, West Virginia, South Carolina, Arkansas, and Mississippi. Similarly, only four States of the fifteen in the Northeast and Great Lakes region have a population of less than 35,000 Hispanic Americans—Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island—and only one of the remaining eleven States has a population of less than 60,000, namely Minnesota.

How do these population statistics compare with the other major minority group in the country? There are ten States in which the Black population constitutes less than 1%—as contrasted with sixteen States with a Hispanic population of less than 1%. In seven of these States, both the Black and the Hispanic American populations have less than 1%: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Minnesota, and North and South Dakota. The States with a small Black population also tend to be the States with a small Hispanic American population! There are eleven States wih a Hispanic population larger than the Black population: Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, Utah, California, Hawaii, Wyoming, Idaho, Montana, and South Dakota. As is the case with the Black population, there is no State without a Hispanic American community.

Roughly, the Hispanic American population is slightly above 4.5% of the total population in the United States. Regionally, the data is as follows:

[As a percent of total population]

	Hispanic American	Black
United States	4.5	11
Northeast	4.0	10
North-central	2.0	8
South	5.0	19
West	11.0	5

The percent distribution of the Hispanic American population by regions is as follows:

[As a percent of the group]

	Hispanic American	Black
United States (millions)	9.2	22.6
Percent total	100.0	100.0
Northeast	21.0	19.0
North central	12.0	19.0
South	30.0	52.0
West	37.0	8.0

A review of the above two tables shows that as a percent of the total population the distribution of both the Hispanic and the Black population are relatively evenly distributed—with one major exception in each case: the Hispanic population in the North Central area is less than half of the national percent of the total population; the Black population in the West is less than half of the Black population as a percent nationally. With respect to the population distribution as a percent of the two groups it can be seen that the Hispanic population is more evenly distributed, whereas more than half of the Black population is in the South.

What do these regional data illustrate? On the one hand they show that the Hispanic American Issue is a national question. On the other hand they show that they are not "ethnic regions", that is, each region is a "Hispanic American Region", rather than an ethnically identifiable region. Using the Census region breakdown, the Hispanic Issue becomes as much a Southern Issue, as the Black issue is a Western Issue—for in both cases the two minority groups have an almost identical population distribution in these regions as a percent of the total population. Even when only the Deep South and the Border States are taken into consideration, the fact still remains that there are nearly one million Hispanic Americans in these States—with the majority being outside of Florida.

To contend that the Hispanic issue is a "Southwest Issue" because slightly over 50% is in that area, and then contend that the Black population is "national" in scope—though less than 48% lives outside of the South—is to raise a question about the rationality or correctness of the criteria used for defining a "national issue".

A note of caution is appropriate concerning these conclusions based on the 1970 Census 5% sample. In its *Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics*, Series P–20, *No. 264, Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1973* (May 1974), there has been a 16.6% increase in the Hispanic population since 1970, from 9,072,602 to 10,577,000. The 1973 CPS has a 38.8% increase for Chicanos, and a 34.6% increase for Cubanos. Only an 8.3% increase is listed for Boricuas. It follows that the previously mentioned distributions have changed considerably. Yet, on the whole, this should result in a further butressing of the major propositions made in this brief report.

What is not clear, and perhaps is highly questionable, is the fourfold increase of the Chicano population as compared to the Puerto Rican population over the same time span. Part of the explanation has been ascribed to fertility, yet if that is the major cause for the increase in the Chicano population, then a similar high rate would be anticipated for Boricuas—perhaps even a higher rate. Likewise, the Central, South, and "other" Hispanic American population would have been expected to increase, instead that latter sector has decreased by 20% according to the above CPS. Where, why, and how this decline has taken place is not clear.

It would not however, change the overall *Hispanic* population distribution. As a percent of the total population, the Hispanic population rose from 4.5 to 5.1%. Caution is also appropriate from a different perspective, for the nation's statistical systems have always had a great difficulty in providing for an accurate count or estimates relative to seasonal, migratory, and farm workers. If anything, they probably add to the number of Hispanic Americans in the rural areas, adding to the Hispanic communities in those States which have a smaller number

or percentage of Hispanics. Thus, even the most current statistics of the Bureau of the Census add to the national scope of the issue at hand, tending to confirm conclusions based on a formally recognized underrenumeration and underestimation of the size of the Hispanic American population.

Past and current policies and programmatic approaches to help resolve economic disadvantages and terminate abuses against constitutional and civil rights of the Hispanic American are *regionally* conceived policies and programmatic approaches! These regional conceptualizations are further encumbered by ethno-political considerations as perceived and defined by the policy-makers! The results of such regional ethnocentricity are two-fold: they resolve neither ethnic group interests, nor the regional interests. The ethnic issue transcends the so-called ethnic regions, and is in fact a national issue for each ethnic group. The regional issue transcends the ethnic issue, and is in fact a multi-ethnic issue in all regions.

A policy perspective addressing itself to the *ethno*-political considerations inherently does not address itself to the regional or the national issue posed by the Hispanic Americans *or* by each of the Hispanic American subgroups. Nor does such a perspective respond to the actual ethno-*political* factors that exist on State and local levels from San Diego, California to Boston, Massachusetts, and Dade County, Florida to Cook County, Illinois. The question that is raised, therefore, is this: "In defining the Hispanic American ethnic subgroups and basing public policies on the political definitions of these groups, are the policy-makers enhancing or preventing solutions to the socio-economic issues facing all of the subgroups?"

With respect to the Hispanic American, it is apparent that policy-makers and public leaders are addressing themselves less to the social and economic plight facing millions of counted or identified Hispanic Americans, than to the political interests and the politically organized among the individual subgroups at select local levels. Thus, even though the Hispanic American Issue is a national social and economic question, and a national demographic issue, it will become a matter of national policy considerations and national policy formulation only when the policy-makers and public leaders—including within the Hispanic American community—transcend preconceptions resulting from racial-ethnic perspectives and identify the issue for what it is: a national social and economic question, and a national political problem.

THE CHICANO IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

Selected Demographic Characteristics in the State With Emphasis on Southwestern Counties

(By K. W. May, Research Associate, National Services Section, National Council of La Raza, Inc.; March 1, 1975)

INTRODUCTION

Idaho is one of this nation's less populated states, ranking 41st in terms of population. As is the case with each of the areas in the Union, it has a significant, yet neglected Hispanic American population. One of the 1970 Census estimates of the latter population notes that there are approximately 16,086 Persons of Spanish Origin among the estimated 712,567 people in this State.[1] Thus, 2.3% of the total population would be of Spanish origin.

Although the Hispanic American population is only slightly larger than it is in, for example, Mississippi or the District of Columbia, it is the largest minority group in the northwestern State. In terms of the Spanish origin count, Idaho ranks thirty-sixth among the States; and 21st with respect to the Mexican-American origin population.

Because the Hispanic American population in Idaho constitutes a significant work-force in certain Idaho counties—particularly, for example, in the Southwestern counties of Washington, Fayette, Gem, Canyon, Owyhee, and Ada—and is an expanding population segment, both in terms of in-migration from states such as Texas and California, and the high birth-rate among the young Hispanic

[1] *Persons of Spanish Ancestry.* 1970 Census of Population Supplementary Report, PC (51)-30. U.S. Bureau of the Census. February 1973. page 1.

families—there is ample reason to review some basic characteristics of this Hispanic American population. Further, because of the concentration of this predominantly Mexican-American population in a few areas of the State, and the increasing assertion of their interests in social and economic activities, one may readily view this evolving ethnic community as a target group for economic development opportunities and activities, from both a regional and national perspective. The interests and needs of Idaho's isolated Chicanos may provide for some important insights in similar diaspora communities in other states and areas of this country which have small, but rapidly expanding Hispanic American populations.

SELECT COUNTY DATA ON HISPANIC AMERICANS IN IDAHO

[By number of Spanish language persons]

Counties	Population	Spanish language persons		Spanish origin persons	Percent unemployed Spanish surname [1]	Recipients of welfare chicanos [1]
		Number	Percent			
1. Canyon	61,288	3,851	[2] 6.3	3,312	9.7	2,530
2. Ada	112,230	1,688	1.5	1,053	9.5	55
3. Minidoka	15,731	1,598	10.2	1,032	12.2	705
4. Cassia	17,017	1,417	8.3	853	2.8	486
5. Bannock	52,200	1,281	2.5	[2] 1,438	15.6	213
6. Bingham	29,167	1,203	4.1	[2] 1,453	5.4	215
7. Twin Falls	41,807	1,185	2.8	1,045	8.0	875
8. Bonneville	51,250	857	1.7	801	6.4	147
9. Elmore	17,479	686	3.9	[2] 856	4.5	276
10. Washington	7,633	623	8.2	534	15.0	106
11. Owyhee	6,422	517	8.1	364	12.3	0
12. Shoshone	19,718	304	1.5	99	12.2	6
13. Jefferson	11,619	301	2.6	0	5.8	8
14. Blaine	5,749	291	5.1	35	0	0
15. Jerome	10,253	265	2.6	[2] 307	13.2	196
16. Gooding	8,645	253	2.9	245	0	57
17. Kootenai	13,452	225	.6	81	0	8
18. Madison	35,332	212	1.6	0	0	16
19. Franklin	7,373	207	2.8	0	0	0
20. Payette	12,401	173	1.4	[2] 865	0	59
21. Gem	9,387	172	1.8	86	0	26
22. Power	4,864	142	2.9	129	0	46
23. Bonner	15,560	124	.8	[2] 141	42.9	5
24. Lemhi	5,566	119	2.1	0	26.3	0
25. Benewah	6,230	116	1.5	57	47.6	2
26. Latah	24,891	94	.4	54	19.0	0
27. Fremont	8,710	89	1.0	[2] 289	0	9
28. Valley	3,609	83	2.8	0	30.8	0
29. Lewis	3,867	74	1.9	[2] 141	26.3	6
30. Nez Perce	3,057	64	.2	[2] 118	0	1
31. Lincoln	30,376	62	2.0	[2] 383	0	0
32. Idaho	12,891	54	.4	0	66.7	0
33. Caribou	6,534	52	.8	[2] 155	0	0
34. Bear Lake	5,801	38	.7	[2] 76	0	0
35. Clearwater	10,871	21	[2] 0	0	[4] 0	0
36. Adams	2,877	18	.6	[2] 23	0	0
37. Custer	2,967	17	[2] 0	0	[4] 0	5
38. Butte	2,925	0	[3] .5	[2] 27	[4] 0	2
39. Boundary	6,371	0	0	0	0	0
40. Oneida	2,864	0	0	0	0	0
41. Teton	2,351	0	0	0	0	3
42. Boise	1,763	0	0	0	0	0
43. Clark	741	0	0	[2] 36	0	1
44. Camas	728	0	0	0	0	0

[1] The unemployment rate and welfare recipient data is from "Poverty in Idaho—1973," a report by the Idaho State Economic Opportunity Office. See pp. 73ff, 92, of the report and footnotes at end of this study. The percent figures after the number of Spanish language persons are taken from the same report, see p. 78, although the report uses the term "Spanish surname."

[2] Asterisk indicates counties in which Spanish origin count is higher than Spanish language count.

[3] Although the Spanish surname percentage provided by the State approximates the actual Spanish language percentage in virtually all counties, there is a discrepancy.

[4] No percentage is provided, to prevent identification of individuals.

LIMITATIONS OF AVAILABLE STATISTICAL DATA

As is the case with all population statistics on Hispanic American communities throughout the country, there is a considerable controversy about the adequacy of such statistics. Local and State estimates tend to be at odds with estimates

of the Bureau of the Census.[2] In part, perhaps, this is due to the small 5% sample used by the Bureau in its 1970 census estimate of the Spanish origin population. This factor may have a major bearing on the statistical accuracy of the estimate for urban, rural, and other non-metropolitan area Hispanic American counts. In addition, particularly in such heavily agricultural states as Idaho, there is an annual flow of migrant workers—and their families—which, although constituting an important element in that State's labor force, may not be statistically reflected in Census data.

Elucidating the fragile nature of the 1970 Census data, is the Bureau's 1973 Current Population Survey, which estimated a 16.3% increase nationally—since the 1970 Census—in the Spanish origin population. However, it estimated a 38.8% increase nationally for the same period, with respect to the Mexican-American population, and a 33% increase in the "Other Spanish Origin" population.[3] If applied to the State of Idaho, the latter's Mexican-origin population could have increased considerably from the 1970 figures of 10,478 to 14,543, and the other Spanish origin population would have moved up from 5,303 to 7,053, to a total of well over 21,500 for the Spanish origin population.

Further complicating this issue is the Census Bureau's use of different identifiers for the Hispanic American population, such as "Persons of Spanish Language". Under this category there were approximately 2,390 or 12.9% more Hispanic Americans than in the 1970 Census Spanish Origin count—18,476 Persons of Spanish Language or 2.6% of the total population in Idaho.[4] It is apparent that since the 1970 Census there was also a significant increase in the "Spanish Language" population so that a reasonable estimate for Idaho may will be above 25,000 for that population.

There are serious identification problems created by the Census Bureau pertaining to the estimates on Hispanics provided by the 1970 Census samples. Which in turn create serious Economic and Service Delivery Problems to local units of Government. Census indicates for instance, six counties in Idaho with no *Spanish Origin* counts. Yet unemployment rates of Spanish Surnamed individuals can be identified ranging from 66.7% to below 1%; four counties with no Spanish Origin population counts. According to Census figures, recipients of welfare identified as "Chicanos" by the State: three other counties with "no Spanish Language persons" but with identifiable Chicano welfare recipients, one such county identifies both Chicano welfare recipients and unemployed "Spanish Surnamed" persons.

Of the thirteen counties identified by the Census as having no "Spanish Origin" population, eight have "Spanish Language" populations. Conversely, counties identified as having no "Spanish Language", have "Spanish Origin" populations. There are, in addition, thirteen counties whose "Spanish Origin" population count is significantly higher than the count for "Spanish Language" persons, and sixteen counties with a significantly larger "Spanish Language" population count that "Spanish Origin" person count.

If one were to add only those counties' largest counts of the *Hispanic American* population—that is, the "Spanish Language" or "Spanish Origin" counts, whichever is higher—then an additional 2,011 persons would need to be added to the high count of the "Spanish Language" person count, making for a total 1970 Census estimate of 20,487 of the Hispanic American population. This is nearly 11% difference over the "Spanish Language" count, and a 27.4% difference or 4,401 over the "Spanish Origin" count of the 1970 Census.

One might also note the discrepancy in the Puerto Rican birth and percentage count in the Census Bureau documents pertaining to the Spanish Origin identifier. Whereas the county data on Puerto Ricans totals 99 in the *General Social and Economic Characteristics—In Idaho*, the state-wide total for Puerto Ricans in the February 1973 Supplementary Report, *Persons of Spanish Ancestry* is 232.

Thus, while the above issues may raise a possibly statistically insignificant issue with regard to most of the individual counties in question, the issue becomes

---

[2] See, for instance, *Counting the Forgotten*—The 1970 Census Count of Persons of Spanish Speaking Background in the United States. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. April 1974.

[3] *Persons of Spanish Origin in The United States. March 1973.* Population Characteristics. Current Population Reports, Series P–20, No. 264. U.S. Bureau of the Census. May 1974. Page 9.

[4] *General Social and Economic Characteristics*—Idaho; 1970 Census of Population. U.S. Bureau of the Census. January 1972. Page 14–117. See also *District Characteristics—Idaho.* PC (1)–D 14. June 1972.

significant with respect to the State-wide count and otherwise points to a factor of considerable bearing for those counties identified as having larger Hispanic American populations.

There are, in short, major limitations on the available statistical data concerning Hispanic Americans in Idaho. It follows that the social and economic characteristics collected by the Bureau of the Census may not accurately reflect the condition of the Hispanic American population, and in particular of the Mexican American population.

Further, it can be hypothesized that the Hispanic American population segment most liable to not being accurately in the general Census data, is that population which is poor, unemployed or jobless, and otherwise isolated from the economic mainstreams of society. In general, the Hispanic Americans of Idaho have such economic characteristics.

GENERAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS: STATE-WIDE[5]

Of the 18,476 persons identified as of Spanish-language origin, 16,350 are identified as native born, and 2,126 as foreign born. Although there were 5,669 persons of Mexican foreign stock, 4,149 were native of foreign or mixed percentage and only 1,520 were foreign born. A total of 1,265 alien Mexican origin persons were identified, and 659 naturalized citizens of Mexican origin. The number of foreign born from Canada is considerably larger (2,077), as is the number of foreign or mixed parentage from Canada (8,375). Of the 15,709 persons of Spanish language 5 years and older, 372 persons lived abroad during 1965—an apparent indicator that most of the Mexican origin population in Idaho either resided in the state of Idaho, or in some other area of the United States, and indeed, only 3,473 are identified as having lived in a different State. Of the latter population, 2,032 from the West and 1,265 from the South came to Idaho, revealing a predominant in-migration from the Texas and California areas.

The Hispanic American [Spanish language persons unless otherwise indicated] population is a relatively young population, with a median age of 17.8 and 50.7% or 9,381 of the population below age 18. According to the 1970 Census, that population is not primarily a farm population, for only 8.9% or 1,652 reside in the rural farm areas. 38.3% or 7,075 are in rural non-farm areas, and 52.8% are located in the urbanized areas of the State (9,381). 28.2% of all males 16 years old and over are former servicemen (1,394).

The median school years completed for those 25 and older is 8.8 for males and 9.0 for females, considerably below the state median. 38.9% have a high school education or more, 21.9 less than 5 years of elementary education, and 51.6% less than one year of high school. Of the population age 18 to 24, only 39% have 4 years of high school or more, indicating virtually no change in educational attainment patterns from the older—25 years and above—age bracket. 37.3% of the age bracket 16–21 years are not high school graduates—as contrasted with only 10.0% of the white or European-origin population.

The Employment Status of the Spanish Language population 16 years and older is illustrated in the following tables:

LABOR FORCE DATA

	Male	Female
A. Total	5,164	4,822
B. In labor force	4,240	2,032
Percent	82.1	42.1
C. Civilian labor force	4,022	2,032
Employed	3,659	1,835
Unemployed	363	197
Percent	9.0	9.7
D. Not in labor force	924	2,790
Enrolled in school	313	401
65 and older	201	166
Percent disabled below 65	67.7	15.9

[5] *Ibid.* (Except as otherwise indicated, all data in this chapter are taken from the above Census of Population on the State of Idaho.)

OCCUPATION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS 16 AND OVER

	Total	Female
Professional, technical, and related	361	134
Managers and administrators (nonfarm)	209	49
Sales workers	189	65
Clerical and related workers	442	292
Craftsmen, foremen, and related	422	25
Operatives, except transport	1,160	618
Transport equipment operatives	261	7
Laborers, except farm	487	81
Farmers and farm managers	151	4
Farm laborers and foremen	1,103	120
Service workers, except private household	580	371
Private household workers	69	69

CLASS OF WORKER, 16 AND OVER

	Male	Female
Private wage and salary workers	3,055	1,552
Employee of own corporation	41	14
Federal employees	104	54
State government employees	133	76
Local government employees	114	80
Self-employed workers	247	58
Unpaid family workers	6	15
Agriculture (all ages)	1,216	152
Wage and salary workers	1,070	142
Self-employed workers	140	4
Unpaid family workers	6	6

The previous three tables would appear to indicate a considerable diversification in manpower resources, particularly in the non-agricultural field, as well as the availability of in-State resources for local development purposes. At the same time, however, available data on the number of weeks worked indicates the following breakdown:

WORKERS IN 1969 BY WEEKS WORKED

	Male	Female
16 yr old and over:		
50 to 52 weeks	2,560	644
27 to 49 weeks	1,178	699
26 weeks or less	851	1,592

The median weeks worked for males 16 to 24 years was 39.5. The breakdown for females in the same age bracket was: 50–52 weeks, 189; 27–49 weeks, 161; and 26 weeks or less, 712.

The above statistics lead to the apparent conclusion that the rate of unemployment among both Hispanic American men and women is considerably higher than indicated under the unemployment rates of the previous table. More than half of the women 16 and older in the labor force listed as employed, are employed for a period of less than six months in a year, and approximately one of every five males of that same age population is employed less than half a year.

These statistics would explain, in part, the low income levels of that population. The median family income for the total population is $8,351 whereas it is nearly $2,000 lower for the Spanish language population ($6,415). Of the total number of Spanish language families—3,593—897 families have an income of $4,000 or less; 1,695 have an income ranging from $4,000 to $8,999; and 1001 have an income of $9,000 and above. 8.6% of the Spanish Language families receive public assistance payments, as compared with the 3.5% rate for the total population. Conversely, only 3.4% of the Spanish Language persons receive Social Security payments, whereas 9.9% of the population defined as white receives such assistance.

26.1% of the Spanish Language population families have an income of less than the poverty level, compared with 10.7% for the white population, and 19.7% for the Black population in Idaho. Nearly two-thirds of the poor Spanish language families—603 persons of the total 936—have an income of less than 75% of the poverty level.

Thus, while there are extensive manpower resources in the State's Spanish Language population, this resource pool is vastly underutilized, and consequently is proportionately lower-income and poor. The economic plight is further illustrated, and accentuated, by the housing conditions facing the Spanish Origin population. Of the total number of housing units of the Spanish Origin population (3,906), nearly two-thirds, or 2,622, were built before 1950.[6] These are also facilities which tend to need plumbing, electrical, heating and other improvements.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS: SELECT SOUTHWEST COUNTIES

How does the southwestern part of Idaho fit into the general picture presented above? Approximately 41% of the Persons of Spanish Language in the State are concentrated in the seven southwest counties of Washington, Payette, Gem, Canyon, Owyhee, Ada and Elmore—an estimated total of 7,715 people. (An estimated total of 5,336 Persons of Spanish language live in the Counties of Canyon, Gem, Owyhee, Payette, and Washington or 29% of the Spanish Language population in the State.) Canyon county, immediately west of Idaho's only SMSA (Boise), has the largest single concentration of Hispanic Americans in the State, with more than twice the Hispanic population than in any other county. Although there is a significant population concentration in Ada which encompasses the SMSA and has the State's second largest Spanish Language population, only 9% of the Hispanic population the State resides there, whereas 21% of that population resides in Canyon County, and slightly over 50% of the Hispanic population in the seven counties is located in the same county. The following table provides a breakdown of some general characteristics of the five western-most counties.

	Canyon	Gem	Owyhee	Payette	Washington
Population total	61, 288	9, 387	6, 422	12, 401	7, 633
Nr. minorities [1]	4, 856	251	935	427	804
Spanish origin	3, 312	86	364	845	504
Spanish language	3, 851	172	517	173	623
Spanish mother tongue	3, 202	119	466	147	604
Mexican origin	1, 754	76	215	90	166
Nr. Chicano welfare recipients [1]	2, 530	26	0	59	106
Percent unemployed Spanish surnamed [1]	9. 7	0	12. 3	0	15. 0

[1] See "Poverty in Idaho," State Economic Opportunity Office, Department of Special Services, Aug. 31, 1973, pp. 73–77 (table 13, "Receipt of Welfare . . . by County"), and p. 92 (table 29, "Unemployment in Idaho, 1969 Average. 1970 Census, 4th Count"). The welfare data, however is for a period subsequent to the 1970 census, and, therefore, does not allow for correct statistical comparisons.

The statistics on Workers 16 and older in 1969 by weeks worked provides for further clues about the economic conditions facing Hispanic Americans:

	Canyon	Owyhee	Washington
Male	908	116	103
50 to 52 weeks	472	62	34
27 to 49 weeks	294	42	39
26 weeks or less	192	12	30
Female	674	61	120
50 to 52 weeks	133	6	20
27 to 49 weeks	218	29	14
26 weeks or less	323	26	86

[6] *Population and Housing Characteristics for the United States, by State: 1970.* 1970 Census of Population. Supplementary Report PC (S1)–29. U.S. Bureau of the Census. December 1972. Page H5–5.

From the above statistics it can be seen that the actual jobless rate will be considerably higher during the year than the unemployment rates indicate, and that the income levels will reflect this condition:

	Canyon	Owyhee	Washington
Median family income	$5,517	$6,667	$3,571
Percent of families living below 75 percent of poverty level	24.6	23.3	37.8
Percent of families living below poverty level	36.3	23.3	52.0
Percent of families receving public assistance	41.4	.....	.....

Although the Statistics that are provided on these counties' Spanish Language population [*] are not as extensive as the data provided for the general population, they appear to indicate that poverty conditions are widely prevalent in the Southwestern counties Hispanic American communities, far above the average rates for the State's general population as well as the general population of these counties. It is also readily conceivable that the actual extent of impoverishment goes far beyond what these questionable statistics of the 1970 Census reveal.

Apart from the 11 counties with 400 or more Persons of Spanish Language and the five small cities with a population of 10,000 to 50,000, no detailed characteristics are published on the Spanish Origin and Spanish Language persons on a county-wide basis. The Spanish Origin sample is based on the 5% sample, and the Spanish Language sample is based on the 15% sample of the 1970 census. No breakdown is available on a census tract basis, which would allow for an assessment of the accuracy of the samples, or an estimate of educational, employment, and other characteristics. The only data for all counties is the population estimates under the various categories—e.g. Spanish Origin, Language, Mother Tongue, Mexican Origin, and Puerto Rican birth and parentage.

The only other significant data readily available for all counties is state government beneficiary data on Chicanos on welfare, and State government estimates of unemployment rates of Spanish Surnamed persons. This data does not, however, allow for comparability with 1970 census data. The Welfare recipient data covers the year through 1972, and only identifies Chicanos on a county-wide level. There also is no county-wide breakdown for the Mexican-American, Mexicano, Chicano in the 1970 census in Idaho. The State's unemployment data provides for rates only, but provides no estimates of the total labor force of either Spanish Origin or—Language persons. Further, the State government uses a "Spanish Surname" identifier and although it appears that the State (in order to arrive at an unemployment rate) has labor force data, it has not made such data available, nor has it provided for a definition of "Spanish Surname" and information on the extent to which the surname indicator provides for accurate statistics.

From studies conducted in the five Southwest states where Surnames were used as one identifier, it is clear that surnames provide for a considerably lower count of the number of Hispanic Americans, than for the Spanish Origin count, which—as has been noted—is lower than the Spanish Language persons count.

Only with respect to five smaller cities, Ada county, which also constitutes the State's role SMSA, and 10 other counties, are there some select detailed characteristics on Persons of Spanish Language. A comparison of the SMSA's data with state-wide data on Persons of Spanish Language indicates major divergences, in terms of median age (23.6); median school years completed for males (12.1) and females (12.4); number of persons employed in agriculture (a total of 21 persons); median family income ($10,874), and percent of families living in poverty (13.0), as well as virtually all other social and economic characteristics.

Only 2% of the Spanish Language population in the SMSA receives public assistance income, and the unemployment rate is 1.6%. While these statistics

[*] *Op. Cit., General Social and Economic Characteristics—Idaho.* See Tables 98, 104 and 133.

may also be subject to considerable criticisms, they do contrast starkly with statistics on the State's Spanish Language population. Thus the data on the SMSA could in no way reflect the conditions of Hispanic Americans in the other counties of the State.

What is clear, however, from the statistics on the general population in the five counties particularly noted here is that they are among the very poorest counties of the state, and were so recognized in the State's Economic Opportunity Office study of 1973, Poverty in Idaho. The following tables illustrate some basic 1970 Census charcteristics about these counties' Spanish Language population. (No other data is available on Gem and Payette Counties, and other counties with Spanish Language Persons below 400.)

	Canyon	Owyhee	Washington
Median age	17.0	16.5	13.0
School years completed (25 years and older):			
Male	6.0	7.8	5.3
Female	7.8	6.1	5.9
Percent high school graduates:			
Male	19.5	6.9	14.4
Female	26.5	6.2	8.0
Percent unemployed (16 years and older):			
Male	9.3	16.7	9.3
Female	10.5		23.0

INCOME LEVELS

	General population		Spanish language persons	
	Median family	Per capita	Median family	Per capita
Canyon	$7,596	$2,270	$5,517	$1,195
Gem	7,547	2,353	(1)	(1)
Owyhee	5,448	1,706	6,667	1,052
Payette	7,143	2,261	(1)	(1)
Washington	6,009	1,855	3,571	851
State	8,381	2,649	6,415	1,606

[1] Not available.

More detailed data on Spanish Language persons in urbanized areas of these counties is available on Caldwell and Nampa (Canyon County).

	Caldwell	Nampa
Total population	14,219	20,758
Spanish origin persons	155	1,349
Spanish language persons	528	1,429
Spanish mother tongue	414	1,261
Mexican origin	199	572

As indicated in the data on Canyon County, both the welfare recipient and unemployment data, there is a massive problem facing this particular county, as well as an enormous waste of human resources. The unemployment rate does in no way reflect the economic plight of the Hispanic community in the State's second largest county. Although no data has been provided on the income levels of the Spanish Language population of this county, it is clear from welfare data that well over two-thirds of the population have an income below the poverty level. Although the county is the chief user of migrant labor in the State, no estimate is provided on the number of migrant workers by the Census Bureau.

CANYON COUNTY

	Caldwell	Nampa
Median age	16.4	18.7
School year completed (25 years and older):		
Male	4.8	6.7
Female	7.5	8.3
Percent of high school graduates (25 years and older):		
Male	17.9	23.6
Female	22.8	34.8
Percent of unemployed (16 and older):		
Male		15.4
Female	22.6	
Worker in 1969 (by weeks worked, 16 and older):		
Male	74	384
50 to 52 weeks	44	171
27 to 49 weeks	25	85
26 weeks or less	5	128
Female	112	261
50 to 52 weeks	5	66
27 to 49 weeks	37	83
26 weeks or less	70	112
Median family income	$5,708	$5,980
Percent of family living below poverty level	26.4	26.2
Percent receiving public assistance		25.0

Mr. MAY. I would like to add a brief comment. There is a study that was done, and it includes materials on Denver, Colo. Perhaps you are familiar with the children's defense fund report on children out of school in America.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. In one of the census tracts that they analyzed they arrived at the conclusion that whereas the Census Bureau found 33 percent of the population to be of Mexican American origin, the study itself was forced to conclude there were twice that many Mexican Americans in that area.

Brief reference was made to a study that the council undertook with regard to Idaho, and copies of that are available, and it raises some very similar issues.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank you both very much for your presentation. I really did appreciate the specificity with which you went through the bill, because I think that is very helpful to us.

Congressman Rousselot also asked me to apologize. He was sorry he had to leave to go to a markup.

The main question then I have is one more clarification on the Spanish origin. I particularly appreciated your comments on section 3. But I take it, then, when you see the census sets out, are you saying you would prefer to see Hispanic or are you saying Spanish origin? Or would you prefer to see a variety of things such as you do with the Asian Americans?

Mr. MAY. Just a brief comment on that. The Immigration and Naturalization Service comes out with annual reports. There was a set of statistics provided from 1820 to 1972, a total of 230,000 Spanish-origin people arrived in this country. The Spanish origin, which has a European ethnic, white ethnic connotation and which has legal implications in terms of the 14th amendment, for example, is quite a different population issue than Western Hemisphere Hispanic Americans or Latinos.

The terminology isn't the question. The question is what kind of statistical implications there are.

Mr. OLIVAS. Madam Chairperson, to answer your question further, in our testimony on page 15 there is a footnote—in our seeking cubits in this area—with regard to the planning of a particular project. We communicated with the Director of the Census Bureau, and through our Congressman we got a response. His letter is quoted. This was with regard to our inquiry on the urban atlas project in which we were looking into the Hispanic issue.

The Director of the Census, Mr. Vincent Barabba, states in his response to our Congressman:

> During the planning of the project, serious consideration was given to the possible inclusion of a map showing the Spanish origin population. However, the inclusion of this data item was dropped for budgetary reasons. The budget constraints allowed for the inclusion of only 12 census characteristics, and since the Spanish origin population is not necessarily national in scope, this subject was reluctantly excluded from the final publication program.

Now, additionally, if you turn to the last two pages which are addendums, these are minutes of the Advisory Committee on Population Statistics to the Census which we attended and participated in. If you note, page 7 of those minutes shows a whole series of identifiers.

Now, by placing "Hispanic American" and recognizing its role as an umbrella similar to the Asian and others that we have spoken to earlier, and then, under those, having the subcategories, I'm sure that no one in the Hispanic community would object to that kind of identifier, because if he were a Cuban or, as you mentioned earlier, through marriage or some other, the offspring of that matrimony could identify with Hispanic American.

So perhaps that answers in kind of a roundabout way two questions, yours and Congressman Rousselot's, with regard to the possible rationale for not including some issues that were raised earlier to a member of the Census staff.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I understand. Thank you very much.

Mr. MAY. Could I make one more comment pertaining to Assistant Secretary Wetzel's comments? The Assistant Secretary made it appear as if Hispanic Americans were better off in terms of unemployment statistics than even the white population, and it might be of some interest to look into the enormous number of Mexican Americans, other Hispanic Americans who work less than 26 weeks—26 weeks or less—during a year.

It might be useful to look into some other areas—States and counties—particularly with regard to Hispanic American women, where 30 to 40 percent of Hispanic American women in the labor force work less than half a year. These kind of statistics, of course, don't show up. If a person works 1 week or 2 weeks, he is employed. He shows up as an employed person.

So Mr. Wetzel's comments should be somewhat modified on that.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I couldn't agree with you more, and I think that is one of the reasons I get so angry in this area, that they admit really that the statistics are very rudimentary in this whole thing, and so to come in and say they are better off. That's why I was saying I certainly hope you will put a footnote in saying on what basis they made that statement.

Thank you very much.
Mr. OLIVAS. Thank you very much.
Mrs. SCHROEDER. Is Narciso Cano here?
Welcome. You are the national director for SER?

STATEMENT OF NARCISO CANO, ASSISTANT NATIONAL DIRECTOR, SER—JOBS FOR PROGRESS, INC.

Mr. CANO. No; I am not. I am the assistant national director.
Mrs. SCHROEDER. Very good. Welcome.
Mr. CANO. Thank you.
May I have your permission to read an edited version of our prepared statement?
Mrs. SCHROEDER. Certainly.
Mr. CANO. Thank you.
I am testifying on behalf of Ricardo Zazueta, our national director.
As you may know, with the passage of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, all manpower programs, including SER, turned to local prime sponsors, which are units of Government, for funding. The formula for distribution of funds for manpower training programs and for public service jobs is based on small area unemployment and lower income statistics.
Furthermore, prime sponsors in utilizing CETA funds are required to identify those most in need, including low-income persons and persons of limited English-speaking ability, the poverty population, special target groups, and significant segments of the population.
The prime sponsors are also required to service areas of substantial unemployment within their areas.
But the Department of Labor and prime sponsors have now come to realize what the Spanish-origin community has been saying for the years 1970 through now—that there is a lack of current small area unemployment, underemployment, and low income statistics for the Spanish-origin.
Although the Department of Labor and the prime sponsors have realized that there is a lack of data, unfortunately, they have decided to make do with whatever outdated and incomplete data is available instead of providing for new systems or revising existing data-collecting systems.
The Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Employment Service, as well as the Bureau of the Census are responsible for most of the data-gathering systems now providing information to Federal agencies for the implementation of multibillion dollar Federal programs. Their data is incomplete, in most cases not available on a small area basis, and inadequate with respect to the Spanish-origin.
Many billions of dollars, we feel, are authorized for the poor, uneducated, and unemployed which are not being distributed equitably across the country to those most in need because there is a lack of small area data identifying the extent of poverty among the Spanish-origin.
House Joint Resolution 92 is a major step to a complete revamping of the Federal Government data-gathering systems. Toward this same goal, SER encourages Congressman Dominick Daniels, chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower, Compensation and Health and

Safety, to create a congressional commission with a task of conducting a comprehensive study of the Federal Government's data-gathering systems on labor statistics.

We understand that Congressman Daniels has recently been giving serious consideration to such a commission. Federal legislation has increased the demand for detailed current and small area labor statistics, and the Daniels commission, which we hope will soon be realized, should be charged with the responsibility to propose sweeping changes in the labor statistics-gathering procedures so as to assure that timely and small area statistics will be available for the Spanish-origin.

The Spanish-origin community we believe will support any effort to assure that correct information is available for the equitable implementation of legislation at the local level.

Now we would like to make a few brief comments on the Census Advisory Committee on the Spanish-origin population for the 1980 Census. The Bureau of the Census is now preparing to appoint Spanish-origin Americans to sit on this very important commission which will serve to first generate support by the Spanish-origin community for the 1980 census; second, after the 1980 census is conducted, to help channel information down from the Bureau to Spanish-origin individuals and groups; but, most important, third, to analyze the Bureau's detailed plans for more accurately counting the Spanish-origin population in the 1980 census.

We hope that the Commission will make suggestions for improving same.

Accordingly, we urge the Bureau of the Census to assure that at least 50 percent of those persons named to the Commission have strong backgrounds in statistics, demography, or mathematics.

It is imperative that the Spanish-origin community be represented by individuals who are trained in the terminology and techniques which the Bureau utilizes. In this way the committee can more readily come to grasp with very complex subject matter and Bureau policy decisions to which the Bureau will be asking the committee to agree and publicly support.

As mentioned earlier, we believe the barrios have already lost many millions upon millions of Federal moneys authorized for the poor to improve education, housing, health, and employment. The Spanish-origin cannot afford a repeat of the 1970 census mistakes in 1980.

We also request that modifications in the data base upon which revenue sharing and other formula moneys are currently being distributed be immediately revised to reflect the estimated undercount of the Spanish-origin population in the 1970 census.

Thank you for your time. If there are any questions, perhaps I can answer them.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank you very much. I appreciate your patience in waiting through this long hearing.

I guess in essence what you are really saying is the lack of statistics means a lack of funds for programs that are very vital, such as yours.

Mr. CANO. Yes; we do. Specifically, we are concerned with the distribution of CETA funds under titles I, II, and VI, which grant funds on the basis of unemployment. And to the extent that the Spanish-origin are excluded not only in the Current Population Survey but

more importantly in the data base used to distribute moneys once they get to the prime sponsor we find in almost all the cases the 1970 data base is still being used with no effort to reflect the undercount that was announced by the Bureau of the Census recently. No effort.

As a result, the Spanish-origin communities and the various prime sponsors we feel aren't getting their fair share of the moneys—once they hit the prime sponsor.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think that is just one of the many programs that are allocated probably on that basis.

Mr. CANO. Yes; we think so. Vocational money too. Half billion dollars of Federal moneys allocated in this form.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I really appreciate your testimony, because so often people think, "What's all this about the census? Who really cares how many?" But when you see so many Federal programs being geared to that formula, you begin to realize how difficult it is and how you are locked into the census, if it is wrong, for 10 years. It's very critical.

Mr. CANO. That's right.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I certainly appreciate your testimony.

Mr. CANO. Thank you.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. There are no further witnesses, therefore the meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]

○